

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 296

SO 021 234

AUTHOR Ferguson, Thomas, Ed.; Goldberg, Steven, Ed.
TITLE Interpretations. Volume 3.
INSTITUTION Oak Park - River Forest High School, Oak Park,
Ill.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 101p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - General (020)
JOURNAL CIT Interpretations; v3 1990

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS High Schools; History Instruction; *Research Papers
(Students); Secondary Education; *Social Studies;
Student Projects
IDENTIFIERS Oak Park and River Forest High School IL

ABSTRACT

The Division of History, Government, and Social Sciences of Oak Park and River Forest High School (Illinois) has selected the very best student writing done by its students, for publication in this annual compilation. Works in the following categories are featured: oral histories, contrasting viewpoints, historical essays, book reviews, reflections, and speeches. (DB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

OAK PARK AND RIVER FOREST HIGH SCHOOL

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

* This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

□ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
ERIC position or policy.

WORLD
HIST

LAW
GOVER

PHILOSOPHY



AMERK

HIS

"THOSE THINGS THAT ARE BEST"

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

THOMAS
FERGUSON

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

STUDENT
WRITINGS

VOL 3
1990

INTERPRETATIONS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Feb 120 05

OAK PARK AND RIVER FOREST HIGH
SCHOOL
OAK PARK, ILLINOIS

DIVISION OF HISTORY, GOVERNMENT
AND SOCIAL SCIENCE

"Those Things That Are Best"

Interpretations is the effort of the History Division to showcase, encourage and recognize some of the most outstanding writing now being done in our school. The essays, research paper, book reviews and other student work herein presented represents only a fraction of the work, both submitted and not submitted for publication, now being produced across the spectrum of the History Division's curriculum.

We regret that Interpretations can not feature even more selections, but the need for variety, and the effort to feature different topics, presented the editors with their most difficult task - choosing the articles to include in the journal.

We hope that this third edition of Interpretations will enlighten, inform and entertain the reader. We continue to be impressed with the serious, scholarly and creative quality of the many fine works submitted. Such efforts give substance to our motto, "Those Things That Are Best."

We would like to acknowledge the hours of dedicated effort and organization by Louise DeAlba, Jenny Smith, Michael Swierk, Liz Weiser and our student illustrator, Timothy Riordan, who was selected the winner in our competition for the design of the journal's cover.

The Editors -

Mr. Averbach
Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Goldberg
Mrs. Hutchinson
Mr. Ostendorf
Mr. Pobst

May, 1990

CONTENTS - VOLUME 3 - MAY 1990

Oral Histories

Caps Off! by EMILY HALL	1
Vietnam - An Interview With Dr. Paul Balter by NANCY BALTER	4
A Boy Goes To War: A Man Remembers by SCOTT WILLIAMS	8
Trauma in the Philippines by BRIAN RUDER	11

Contrasting Viewpoints

Abortion: Fatal Fetal Implications by JASON DELL	14
The Morality of Abortion by CARRIE NELSON	18
Viva In Vitro! by EMILY HALL	21
A Priceless Child - The Ultimate Consumer Product by CYBELE SEIFERT	24

CONTENTS - VOLUME 3 - MAY 1990

Contrasting Viewpoints

The English Parliamentary Revolt: A Religious and
Political Conflict by ANDREW BOIES 28

The Rise of English Capitalism and The Civil War
by BRIAN RUDER 30

Historical Essays

On Marx's Historical Materialism by LUKE JACOB 34

The Ineffectiveness of the Articles of Confederation
by ALEX MARCHETTI 37

Ideology and Power-Politics in the Eras of Religious
War and Cold War by BEN SUSSMAN 39

The Golden Shell by BRIAN HAMMERSLEY 44

Maladies of the Moderates by ANDREA GREGOR 47

CONTENTS - VOLUME 3 - MAY 1990

Historical Essays

- The Ever Challenged Bismarck
by GREGORY A. KROLL 51
- John Swanick's Winning Formula
by SHANNON M. SCHAAB 54
- The Spider and His Web: Bismarck's Post-Unification
Foreign Policy by BRIDGET LAFFLER 56

Book Reviews

- Savage Warfare by JOANNA MYERS 59
- A Man For All Seasons by BETH BROWN 61
- The Popularization of Abolitionism
by GARY HELMLING 63
- The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin
by SARAH HOISINGTON 65

CONTENTS - VOLUME 3 - MAY 1990

Reflections

The Healing Power of Laughter by NICOLE ZACCARIA	67
Modern Adaptations To Aristotle by MARK HUMOWIECKI	70
Mexico by TINA MARSICO	73
The Effect of the Depression On My Grandfather by LORI LYNCH	74
Truly Underage - Fetal Alcohol Syndrome and Its Effect On The Brain by JENNIFER BURTON	76
Campfire Chatter by TERRY O'BRIEN	80
How He Did It: An Analysis of Gorbachev's Strategy For Staying in Power by BRIDGET LAFFLER	82

CONTENTS - VOLUME 3 - MAY 1990

Reflections

- Two Political Views of Machiavelli and Oliver North
by ELLEN PETRICK AND DAVID CZERWINSKI 84
- The Existence of Evil by ERIC TRUETT 88

Speeches

- The Time is Now For Racial Unification
(Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day Speech-1990)
By JUANTA BENNETT 91
- Patriots of Promise (Memorial Day Speech - 1989)
by TRACY CLAY 92

CAPS OFF!

By Emily Hall

Herman the talking stapler was my friend. Actually, I have very few memories of Herman, apart from the fact that he provided countless hours of entertainment. Herman was created to divert me to quieter forms of activity in the busy ERA office in Chicago. I have other related childhood memories, including: giving Jane Pauley a chocolate chip cookie as she attempted to conduct an interview in our living room and watching my mother on the Phil Donahue show. The subject of this essay is not me, nor Herman; it is my mother, Kristine T. Hall.

The 1970's was a time for movement, for change. In the deep south, the cries for racial equality were finally being heard. A parallel protest was arising from women across the nation, demanding equal rights with men. During the time that the civil rights movement began to gain strong national attention, Kris Hall left her tiny home town of Fallon, Nevada to study nursing at Cook County Hospital in Chicago. By the time she was twenty-eight, she was the head nurse of the cardiac unit at a major Chicago area hospital. "At that time the director of nursing at the hospital ran the department under strict and hackneyed regulations." The director required the nurses to adhere to a five-page dress code for female nurses; male nurses had none. It was in April of 1974 that vehement anger concerning the dress code, more specifically the rule insisting that all fe-

male nurses wear caps, turned into a symbolic feminist issue. It was a comment from a male nursing supervisor that opened the entire question.

After spending three hours helping resuscitate a patient undergoing cardiac arrest, Hall and two nurses were straightening up the unit. The arrest had occurred at a shift change, and they had not had time to don caps. A male nursing supervisor entered and demanded, "Where are your caps, girls?" Hall was so angered and frustrated by the remark that she refused to wear her cap again. Within a week, she was fired for not adhering to dress code regulations and not insisting that her staff observe them either.

It must be noted here that caps, although originally designed for the purpose of hygiene, had evolved into the symbol of the nurse. Caps were given at graduation from nursing school, serving as a symbol of the school, nothing more. Yet some collegiate nursing programs, such as the University of California, had not awarded them in years. Many hospitals no longer required their nurses to wear caps, but some did. The article of dress was a symbol of the archaic, yet persistent, ideology that nursing was regarded as an extension of the unpaid profession of the housewife. Secondly, nowhere in the country were male nurses required to wear caps.

"My problem became symbolic of the women's movement," Hall remembers. "Women were burning their bras, nurses were tossing their caps." Indeed, caps were tossed at the hospital. After she was fired, six of the nurses under Hall refused to wear their caps, and the rule requiring caps to be worn was repealed. But Hall was not re-hired. An asset to the protest, however, was immediate and continuing coverage by the press. "The day I was fired I went home extremely depressed. I expected no public reaction. Three hours later, I received a call from the Chicago Sun Times who had obtained the story from an angry physician at the hospital." By the next day, Hall had an attorney, a woman from the EEOC (Equal Employment Opportunities Commission) and had filed suit against the hospital on the grounds of sex discrimination.

The press coverage was continuous and nationwide. The media frequently quoted from Hall's letter to the nursing director written prior to the firing. This quote appeared in the Chicago Tribune on August 13, 1974: "While most administrators are home in bed at night, a very young nurse sits in our cardiac unit, alone, watching the monitor, and taking full responsibility for the lives of eight patients. She has to know exactly what she is watching, and how to react if something happens. Don't you think she is also capable of making decisions about the world in which she works?" This reflected Hall's growing involvement on the question of women's rights. "I had never, ever been a feminist," she said to me, "and I suddenly became very involved."

After she was fired, Hall went to work for the Illinois Nurses Association (INA), the state branch of the American Nurses Association (ANA). She worked to gain legal protection for nurses, in the form of organized labor contracts. "Unfortu-

nately 'union' was a dirty word then," she reflected, "so we tried never to use it." It seems ironic, however, that nurses feared the creation of a nurses union would cause them to lose their status as professionals, when "we were hardly being treated as professionals in the first place."

INA worked to establish within each hospital a contract for nurses that would give them collective bargaining abilities, grievance procedures, and other rights. The process was long and sometimes agonisingly slow. "First we would target a certain hospital in the state. We would then leaflet the hospital, announcing a meeting concerning the question of organizing the nurses. The meetings were usually held in church basements. If we held them in homes, the residents could have been targeted as labor supporters and risked the possibility of being fired. Even holding the meetings in churches wasn't always protection from anonymity. Hospital administrators would sometimes wait outside the meeting place in their cars, just watching to see who would attend. Slowly, we would gain support, and more nurses would attend the meetings. We had the support of the National Labor Relations Board should we need to file grievance procedures. Finally, when we felt we had enough support and attention, there would be a vote. A lot of times we succeeded, but we lost some, too. Probably the hardest was losing my own hospital by very few votes." There were hospitals throughout the state that voted for organization, however, even in the down state area where opposition was extremely strong. "In some of those down state hospitals nurses still had to rise when doctors entered the room," Hall reminisced with disdain.

Adversity reared its ugly head in many forms: nurses who were afraid of unions, those who felt organized labor too constricting, nurses who just

didn't want to change the old ways, and the sly tactics of administrators and other hospital personnel. "Often times, those arguing against organization would impose guilt on the nurses saying: 'You took an oath when you entered the profession. How could you ever go on strike and our patients?'" But nursing strikes had already occurred in 1973 in California. The movement toward unionization had begun. "My case was the catalyst for organization in Illinois," Hall reflected.

During the time that she worked for INA, Hall also had to attend three hearings concerning her case. Each hearing was packed with supporters: nurses, doctors, people who had become interested in the case through its extensive press coverage, and many members of the National Organization for Women (NOW), the leading feminist organization of the time. In the final hearing the judge ruled that Hall had been discriminated against. The hospital was ordered to apologize, pay two years back salary and attorney fees, clear her record and give Hall her job back. "It was a real milestone for nursing," she said.

Although it was the case that brought Hall in close contact with NOW and the growing ERA movement, it was her work with INA and unionization that made her aware and sympathetic to the cause of women's rights in employment. "Illinois had good labor laws," she felt, "but at the same time I was aware that many nurses, especially in the deep southern states, would never get the same kind of support from their legislatures. I won my case because Illinois had a strong Fair Employment Practices Act. Equal rights for women were dependent on state laws." So, Hall began advocating equal rights on a federal level, beginning her involvement with the ERA, and mine with Herman the Stapler.

"Illinois was a key state in the ratification of the amendment. The state's main argument against ratification was that there was already equal protection in Illinois. So what was the point in fighting for a federal change?" NOW's argument was economically based, stating that without equal employment rights, many women across the nation were left dependent and often poverty stricken. In the end though, it was the cult of domesticity and its offspring that muffled the economic arguments, and ratification failed to take place.

With the failure of the ERA, Kris Hall's cap fight returned to a more personal level. "There is a tragedy in all of this. Had nursing been treated with the respect it deserved forty, fifty years ago, had nursing programs moved into the universities, and abandoned the ridiculous dress code, maybe there wouldn't be such a terrible shortage of nurses today. The image of the low paid, little respected nurse, lives on, and it is an image young women- and men- treat with disdain."

Note: All information for this paper was gathered through interviews with my mother, Kristine Hall.

VIETNAM - AN INTERVIEW WITH DR. PAUL BALTER

By Nancy Balter

"The system of medical care that the U.S. Army brought to Vietnam was the most effective in military history" (Doleman 69). Loss of life and the severity of injuries were minimized through new portable field hospitals, new surgical techniques, and new methods of disease prevention (Doleman 69). The average length of a soldier's hospital stay decreased from eighty days in World War II to sixty-three days in Vietnam (Doleman 69). Field hospitals in Vietnam grew to be large and elaborate because they did not move with the battlefield as had been the procedure in Korea and Europe (Doleman 75). Many doctors were stationed in these elaborate hospitals and for those who were, the real war would often feel distant from their lives. A *Newsweek* article printed during the war pointed out that Saigon was a "bizarre center for come-and-visit war." It claimed that uniforms were few in this city of "old Asia". To see the war close at hand, it said, one would need to take Air-Vietnam's domestic service to elsewhere in the country.

The city of Saigon was bustling with vitality. It was also heavily involved in the black market. An estimated one hundred million dollars a year was drained from the country's economy because of the black market (McArthur). Millions of dollars worth of military items such as batteries, uniforms, gasoline, and food ended up on the black market annually (McArthur).

The following interview was conducted with Dr. Paul Balter concerning his involvement in both the war and the black market in Vietnam. The responses are directly quoted from Dr. Balter.

Q. When did you join the army?

A. I was taken into the army (drafted) in July, 1969.

Q. When were you in Vietnam?

A. 1970-1971

Q. When you left, had many of your friends already gone?

A. Quite a few. All the doctors my year (went). Some went two weeks before me. Some went two weeks after me. Some people had gone several years before me, actually.

Q. Did you have to go through basic training? If so, where and for how long? What was it like?

A. Well, medical basic training. Not the regular basic training. It was in Fort Sam Houston, San Antonio, Texas. Mostly classroom, four days in the field. It was like all the pictures - riflery and running under firing guns.

Q. Were you scared when you went to Vietnam?

A. Only a little bit. I knew where I was gonna (sic) be. I was nervous that there would be a screw up and I wouldn't be assigned to 3rd Field Hospital.

Q. Where were you stationed in Vietnam?

A. 3rd Field Hospital, Saigon.

Q. What did you do there?

A. I was a doctor in the dialysis unit (one of two). In addition, I was sent to a regular evacuation hospital for two weeks because they needed help when I first got there.

Q. What were your living conditions like?

A. Better than almost anyone in the U.S. Army in Vietnam. We were housed to hotel-like apartment houses with running water and tile floors. If you could get an air-conditioner shipped in from the States, you could even have air conditioning.

Q. What were your original impressions about whether or not we should be involved in Vietnam and did they change as you worked in Vietnam and saw wounded soldiers?

A. [Originally,] I definitely thought we were right in being there because I thought all of Southeast Asia would fall if we weren't. Yes, increasingly I came to the conclusion that we

could not win this war because the poor people - particularly the peasants - weren't with us. However, I did not think we would lose completely but rather our side would always hold the cities.

Q. What was your worst experience in Vietnam?

A. There was this one guy in particular. He had both legs shot off. They couldn't fix it. They hung him up under his arms and the blood just dripped onto the floor. The guy could talk and everything. That was definitely the worst experience.

Q. What was your scariest experience?

A. It happened when I took a trip up country. I went up to visit some hospitals up there. They took us out to show us around and they handed me a flak jacket (for protection against schrapnell), a steel pot - that's a helmet, and a rifle. I was scared when they handed me that. I realized that I might need it.

Q. Were you ever in an area where there was fighting around you?

A. Around me? Yes. That I could see? No.

Q. Articles have implied that Saigon felt very removed from the war. Did it feel like a war was going on while you were there?

A. Well, it's certainly true that it was removed from the war. Did it feel like a war? Yes,

because everyone was running around in fatigues rather than the regular dress uniform seen in the States.

Q. Where did you travel in Vietnam and for what reasons?

A. I traveled down into the Mekong Delta and up to a place called Chu Lai for the purpose of explaining to the doctors what kinds of patients they should call us for.

Q. How were other areas different from Saigon?

A. They were either small towns or rice paddies or jungle. (There were) some mountainous areas, too. There were a few cities but nothing like Saigon.

Q. Can you describe a typical day while working in Saigon?

A. Yes - Rounds at 8:30 a.m. in the dialysis unit...see each patient (only three or four were there) and then we would discuss the patients in detail - plan treatments for the day. Then, really, that's the only thing scheduled. War in general is long periods of boredom punctuated by short periods of excitement. Then at any time during the day and sometimes at night we'd sometimes get a telephone call that a patient was coming and then we'd have to be around when the patient came which could be anywhere from ten minutes to several hours later depending on where the patient was coming from. Then, when the patient would come we'd spend several hours examining the patient.

Q. What were other soldiers' and doctors' (around

you) feelings about our involvement in the war?

A. Some were totally opposed. Some were irrational; some hated the situation, hated the army, hated the government, and bored everybody to death talking about it. Others didn't care and were mostly in the black market, chasing women, drinking, or into all kinds of other deals. No one was fanatically in favor of the war.

Q. Were you involved in the black market and how did it work?

A. Everyone was involved in the black market. You had to do something else or you didn't have any spending money. First of all, there were big shortages and there was intense Vietnamese desire for all Western material goods. So people were willing to pay more. Everything was sold on the street and they were getting it from wheeling and dealing with the soldiers.

Q. Did you feel patriotic and a sense of pride? Was that pride stripped from you when we lost the war?

A. Yeah (I felt patriotic). But it was stripped from me even before then (the end of the war). As the year went on my enthusiasm for the war decreased and when I got home people were uninterested and thought I was kind of stupid for getting sent over there.

Q. What did you miss most while in Vietnam?

A. Mommy and Sharon. (wife and daughter)

Q. Did the Vietnam experience affect your

future and how?

A. Oh yes! It gave me training in acute kidney failure that could be obtained almost nowhere else. And it was a major factor in Dr. Muehreke hiring me (after the war) for what turned out to be an excellent position. And it (the Vietnam experience) gave me a taste of international travel unchanged to this day.

Q. Are there any questions I haven't asked?
Other things you'd like to say?

A. Another worst experience was a patient Bobby Hart—remember when we (the family) went to look at his name on the Vietnam memorial? He looked so good and everyone thought we'd save him. And in three weeks he died.

Bibliography

Doleman, Edgar C. Tools of War. Boston: Boston Publishing Company, 1984

McArthur, George. "Black Market: A Lesson in Viet Economics," The Los Angeles Times (Date unknown)

A BOY GOES TO WAR : A MAN REMEMBERS

By Scott Williams

In 1942, an 18-year old Greek boy by the name of John Katsikas was drafted into the United States Army and chose to join the Army Air Corps. When he entered the service, he had no idea what it was about and was completely oblivious to what could happen to him as a bomber pilot for the Army. By the time he left the service in 1945, he became aware of what it was to live through war and, being a pilot, he had seen how the war affected the civilian people in North Africa, India, and China. The memories of how horrible the situation of the civilians was, and the many military casualties which he witnessed, changed John Katsikas's views toward war permanently. He became very cynical about the motives of people in power. Mr. Katsikas' attitudes towards the U.S. government also changed. He felt that the government was able to delude the people, especially the young soldiers, to a point where they felt that they were the best. He felt that the government used subtle propaganda to insure that the soldiers would do what they were told. It is interesting that Mr. Katsikas' general opinion is that, "War has a tendency to enlighten the people and, at the same time, to degrade them".

When John was first drafted and placed in the Army Air Corps, he visited a variety of places before entering the war. His first stop was Jefferson, Missouri for basic training and pre-flight training. Then he was sent to San Antonio, Texas where the men who signed up for the Army Air Corps service were separated into different groups, including pilots, navigators, bombardiers, gunners, and mechanics. Later these men were sent to Elmington Air Base in Ina, Oklahoma for their primary flight training. Finally, the men

were assigned to their own flight crews and were certified to fly a B-24 "Liberator" bomber.

Once he got his crew, John had to start his assignments. Katsikas and his crew started in San Francisco, where they picked up their plane. Then they flew to Tennessee, then to Fort Wayne, on to Maine, then over to Newfoundland, and finally to England. As soon as they landed in England, they received orders to fly to the Azore Islands off the coast of North Africa. Katsikas and his squadron were attached to the 83rd Air Force, which assisted in "Operation Torch", the American invasion of North Africa. For the next few months, the 83rd fought against Rommel's Africa Corp and they bombed targets such as Tripoli and Bengazi.

The next major combat assignment of Lt. Katsikas was the attack on the Romanian oil fields at Ploiesti. When I inquired into his initial reaction to this raid, his response was, "Is—in my pants!" This just goes to show how young and unprepared these men were for the duty that they were given.

In the first attempted raid on the oil fields, the squadron suffered sixty percent casualties and in his words were "...knocked to pieces" by the German "Foch Wolves" and anti-aircraft batteries. When they returned to their base, the remaining forty percent of the bomber crews went on strike against returning to the oil fields again unless they received fighter support. For their action these remaining crews were separated and reassigned to different areas.

At this time, John Katsikas and his crew were

sent to India. They were part of the CBI — China, Burma, India — theater. His longest single assignment was attacking the Japanese in Indo-China from India over a period of nine months. During his stay in India, he spent a lot of time on the ground. The formula for a pilot's duty was for every hour you spent in the air, you spent 24 hours on the ground doing nothing. With all this ground time, he was able to witness the enormous problems that faced the millions of civilians who were caught in the war, as well as the individual wars for equality and independence led by Mahatma Gandhi.

After nine months of combat against the Japanese, he was then assigned to fly supplies over the Himalayas from India to China. This duty was the worst in John's experience because, as he said, "...we lost more planes flying over 'the hump' than we did in combat".

In November of 1945, he and his crew were finally called home and were to report to West Palm Beach, Florida to check in, making several stops along the way. Mr. Katsikas' ground crew of four men, however, would have to wait three months for an Army transport ship to arrive and pick them up. John, who was a captain by this time, decided that he couldn't leave his crew behind in India; so he had them remove all the guns and any other non-essential materials from the plane. This gave him enough room to fit in the four ground crewmen and their gear. On their trip home, he kept one step ahead of the military police and the generals by taking the "long way home". Captain Katsikas went from Calcutta to Bombay to Khartoum to Dakar, French West Africa, across the Atlantic to Brazil, then to British Guiana, Puerto Rico and finally to West Palm Beach.

Needless to say, when they finally got home, the generals were upset and threatened him with a court martial and prison. However, John Katsikas got off because military law states that both

he and his crew would have to be taken all the way back to India to be tried. So, on November 17, 1945, John Katsikas was discharged from the U. S. Army at Fort Sheridan, Illinois with the rank of Staff Sergeant. Even though he had been a captain, he was what the army called a "bad boy", and they made sure he was demoted before he was discharged.

When I asked John about his attitudes and how they had changed after his experience in the war, he said he had become cynical and resentful toward our government, as well as against war in general. A large part of his resentment came from his experience in India. For the nine months that he spent there, he saw so much poverty and starvation that it made him sick. He couldn't believe that the U. S. government was spending \$25,000 on his training, giving him a million dollar plane and bombs that cost \$5,000 each, when all that these people in India needed was \$5 a month to subsist. Even when they were stationed there, they were responsible for exploiting the Indian people and they didn't even realize they were doing it. The flight crews lived together in thatched huts and they had servants called Bara-Walas who did the sweeping, Manchie-Walas who did their laundry, and Cha-Walas who brought them coffee and tea. These people were paid a dollar a day for their services.

When I asked him why he never got involved with any of the veterans groups, he said, "Because they're a bunch of hypocrites". He felt that they march around waving the flag and never stop to remember all the "garbage and hellish situations" that they went through while they were in the war.

Mr. Katsikas' basic attitude toward war is one of revulsion and hatred. He feels that at the age of 18 or 19 one should not have to go off and risk being killed when one doesn't know what one is fighting for or doesn't want to be there. Young men should not go to war just because their

government tells them that they are defending their country.

The last thing that Mr. Katsikas told me was that Caesar said in a discussion of war, "Veni, Vidi, Vici - I came, I saw, I conquered"; but that I should always remember an older Greek philosopher named Diogenes who said, "I came, I saw, and in disgust, I left".

TRAUMA IN THE PHILIPPINES

By Brian Ruder

As tragically became the situation during the Second World War, thousands of American citizens working, studying, or visiting in the Philippines were interned by the Japanese. Just one of the camps used for this purpose was Santo Tomas, located in Manila. This place alone held over 3500 prisoners of various ethnic persuasions. Santo Tomas was a Catholic university where many American students had been studying. Manila was also a center of business for many Americans, including Ernie Necker. Necker had been located there by the radio company he worked for in the states. Less than one year after arriving in Manila, Ernie Necker and his wife, Rose, were taken by the Japanese and placed in Santo Tomas Internment Camp (STIC) on January 6, 1942. The following essay examines Ernest Necker's personal diary¹ and records kept during the time he was held in Manila.

Life in STIC was difficult. Though the Japanese allowed some autonomy to the prisoners, the feeling among the internees was that this was only done to make the jobs of their Japanese captors easier. The camp had an isolated and simple economy of its own, as the money brought in by the internees was circulated about to purchase food, clothing, or whatever met one's needs. Some of the internees were allowed to purchase shacks in an area of the camp called "Shantytown." These shacks were cramped and, according to Japanese orders, were missing one side so that all activity could be monitored. The shacks provided a place of semi-seclusion during the day, but they had to be evacuated at 6:30 each night. Limited space was allotted for the inmates to grow food of their own, but the gardens never provided much food, and certainly not enough to live on.

Japanese discipline proved to be terribly strict. People were known to disappear at times, rumored to have spoken spitefully about a Japanese officer behind his back, or perhaps caught stealing food to save their starving families. Men and women were kept separate, and a strict curfew was enforced. When the curfew was once violated and nine women turned up pregnant, the Japanese made clear that this was not to be tolerated. The "Big Scandal", as it came to be called, ended in the jailing of many men, some of whom had no involvement in the incident. Once, three men attempted to scale the walls of the camp, "half out of fun," as Necker described it. The men were caught, beaten within an inch of their lives, and then tied to stakes and shot before the entire camp as an example of how "escapees" would be treated. The internees attempted to get on good terms with their supervising officers in order to avoid especially brutal treatment, and ironically a few of the Japanese did the same at the very end of the war in the Philippines, when they came to believe that the camp was to be abandoned. They apparently feared punishment after the war for brutal treatment of the prisoners.

The internees were given barely enough supplies to keep most of them alive. Rations were meager and barely nourishing. The hospital in the camp was constantly filled with victims of malnutrition, many of whom died. Extra food that the Japanese did not want was not divided among the prisoners, but instead fed to pigs. At times the only sustenance that the internees were able to obtain was the hope that they would be freed soon. Even this hope sometimes failed them, as Necker recounts one instance of watching an American B24 go down near the camp and the

tearful disillusionment that followed the event.

In early 1945, the internees knew that the American forces were nearing Manila. The signs of fighting were getting nearer, and rumors persisted that MacArthur was blazing a path to the city. Though this helped to raise the internees' spirits, conditions at STIC reached their lowest point since the creation of the camp. Food rationing became drastic, and the number of malnutrition deaths soared. Seeing this as something that might come back to haunt them after the war, the Japanese ordered all death certificates which involved malnutrition to be changed to other causes such as heart failure. At one point, the names of all military aged men were taken, leaving the inmates in fear that they would be forced to fight against their own country. Internal strife was another problem. Fights often broke out over garden space and other food matters. As Necker stated, "selfishness predominates as we have never seen it before."

Though secluded, the concentration camp managed to communicate with the outside world. The camp produced its own newspaper, the *Inter-nitus* which detailed all of the recent news and expected progression of the war. Necker saved a copy of each issue, and the information provided in them and his diary provide the material for an interesting comparison. Necker was very careful in how he reported the information in his diaries. He had to be fairly sure of rumors (by evaluating and confirming their sources) before putting them in print, and those which were shaky he labeled as such. By evaluating the reported dates of rumored American landings in the Philippines with those actually listed by the Office of Air Force History, one may develop an idea of how accurately information passed through the camp's walls. The results were impressive: every recorded date from a source that Necker believed was reputable was accurate to the extent that all available information is able to confirm. The internees knew about almost every American

landing in the Philippines within one to two days of their occurrence, and Necker did not report any false war data during his entire stay.

By the time the war in the Philippines was coming to an end, the Japanese had begun to act more savagely than ever before. Necker recounts stories of the Japanese holding out against American conquest to the very end, using hostages as shields in battle. The Japanese massacred the occupants of an orphanage in Manila, and savagely destroyed the Santo Tomas hospital, lobbing grenades through windows and gunning down survivors. Necker did not limit himself, however, to the story of STIC alone. The Philippine General Hospital was nearby, and the stories he gathered of the massacres there were horrifying. The Japanese plundered the area, raping and murdering, burning down homes with families inside. Those internees and Filipinos that could be seen in the darkness were immediately shot dead, and some were tortured. One boy had his legs brutally cut off before being thrown into a fire. All in all, a bloody, horrifying picture of the Japanese in wartime was painted by this diary and all of its inclusions.

Who was Ernie Necker and what does his diary mean? Necker proves his diary to be a valuable source of information on the Philippine camps simply by the broad base that he gives, addressing all sides of a situation. He gives information in an indirect manner, displaying the nationalistic, resentful attitude of most of the prisoners in his writings, while giving a firsthand account of events in the same manner a historian would. He evaluates all of his sources of information carefully, giving specific reasons why each one should or should not be believed. He includes testimonies of other internees, recounting their opinions and views exactly as they were stated in a first person manner. Necker brings out both the hope and fear that the internees felt throughout their stay at STIC. The irrationality of the Japanese at some points and the harsh living conditions in which the

prisoners survived are displayed with shocking clarity, shining light on what really happened during those years. Necker was liberated on February 17, 1945, and returned home in early April. One of the most resounding memories Necker had, and one that may hold a great deal of truth, was a statement made on the first of January of that year by Willy, one of the camp's gardeners. Though his comment may be disputable, it certainly reflects the attitudes of those who stayed in Santo Tomas Internment Camp. He said, "New Year's and just look at those two women barely able to walk across the garden, staggering from malnutrition and starvation. There will never be another internment camp in history with so much pathos attached to it." It was a horrible time for all, and the impact of the Second World War in the Philippines will forever remain as a scar upon Japanese and American history alike.

1. Necker and his wife moved to Wilmette, Illinois upon returning to the U.S., where they met my grandmother. They left their house to my grandmother when they died and she moved there in 1988. She found Ernie's wartime diary packed away in the basement, and is now considering submitting it for publication.

Bibliography

Craten, Wesley and Cate, James. The Army Air Forces in WWII (Chicago: U. of C. Press. 1950) vols 3-4

ABORTION: FATAL FETAL IMPLICATIONS

By Jason Dell

Abortion is one of the most heated issues discussed in modern society. Because it deals with the termination of life, or of a form of life, abortion challenges us to analyze the meaning of life for our society and for ourselves. We must make some sort of moral judgment regarding death as a better alternative to life. In addition, the issue of abortion is not clearly defined. Some argue that abortion is only permissible under certain circumstances, and others claim that abortion is always wrong. The issue of abortion demands an understanding of a great variety of opinions and facts.

People have looked for an easy solution to the problem of abortion by trying to discover the point at which life begins. Birth is not a satisfying answer. A fetus changes location and is exposed to the outside world after birth, but its physical development does not advance significantly in those few hours or minutes. A born infant also may be more of a part of society because it is more easily seen and touched, but the bulging midsection of a pregnant woman is significant and apparent as well. Proclaiming life at birth seems to ignore the scientific knowledge we have gained. On the other hand, viability, the time at which the fetus could exist outside of the mother's womb, is an alternative that seems to offer a more substantive point for the beginning of life. The decision of *Roe vs. Wade* was based on such criteria with regard to the trimester specifications. It considers the difference between total dependence and semi-dependence. Yet, such an assertion assumes that being closer to maturity is more valuable than one who

merely has potential. Ten year olds are not usually considered more valuable than two year olds. Technology offers another problem to the viability theory. "Most medical authorities agree that babies who weigh one and one half pounds and have been developing in the womb for 24 weeks or more can be saved by intensive modern medical care about 25 percent of the time" (Van and Gerner 14). Pushing the point of viability back towards conception, science can save the lives of unborn infants earlier every year. Some people believe that the only non-arbitrary point of human life is at conception. Missouri has drawn this distinction in the preamble to its abortion law (Elsasser 14). At conception, a zygote exists with the full genetic code to become a human being.

Once spermatozoon and ovum meet and the conceptus is formed...roughly in only 2 percent of the cases will spontaneous abortion occur. In other words, the chances are about 4 out of 5 that this new being will develop. At this stage in the life of the being there is a sharp shift in probabilities, an immense jump in potentialities (Mappe and Zembaty 11).

The shift in probabilities is certainly present, but we must ask ourselves if such mathematical analysis can determine the beginning of human life, often described qualitatively rather than quantitatively.

Some people do not attempt to define life in terms of such physical stages. Mary Anne Warren

believes that a person must be a full member of a moral community. She suggests five criteria of personhood:

1. Consciousness (of objects and events) and the "capacity to feel pain,"
2. Reasoning,
3. Self-motivated activity.
4. Ability to communicate "messages of an indefinite variety of types,"
5. The presence of self-concepts and self-awareness (Nathanson, p.222-223).

Mental criteria, however, may fail to differentiate the four-hour old child and the seven-week fetus, or the two year old and the eight month fetus. There is certainly doubt as to whether a child under two has enough self-awareness "for personhood", but such a toddler is considered a valued person in nearly every society. In addition, the question may arise regarding killing retarded people because of low intelligence, or killing patients in comas because of lack of consciousness.

Both pro-choice groups and anti-abortion groups have tried to discover when, if ever, the termination of a pregnancy may be justified. Some extreme anti-abortion groups maintain that abortion is never justified, but most people tend to qualify the argument. In some "self-defense" cases, the mother's life would be jeopardized by a continuing pregnancy. Many people also feel that a pregnancy caused by rape or incest or a pregnancy involving a severely deformed child should be terminated if the mother desires an abortion. Such a position appeals to our sympathy, but it is hard to justify in a "sanctity of life" view where the fetus has the same rights as the mother. The most controversial abortion involves the mother's judgement: when she sees it

best not to bring the child into the world. A baby may bring ridicule upon an unwed mother, it may create financial hardship, or the happiness of the mother may be disrupted by the responsibilities involved in the care of a child. Some would argue for an abortion benefitting the fetus that might have been otherwise always at a disadvantage in life. "Indeed, failure to kill such infants...may itself be a violation of their rights...For if we permit such children to grow...knowing full well that the conditions for the fulfillment of their most basic future interests have already been destroyed, then we have wronged these persons before they even exist" (Feinberg 99). Judith Jarvis Thomson offers a list of factors that should be considered in determining whether an abortion is justified:

1. How the pregnancy came about, and especially the extent to which it was agreed to or invited,
2. The burden pregnancy imposes on the woman, and especially the certainty and extent of the threat to her life, health, liberty, or well-being,
3. The benefit that continuation of pregnancy would confer upon the fetus, and especially the extent to which it will be capable of a worthwhile life,
4. The elapsed duration of pregnancy, and especially the extent to which permitting a pregnancy to endure for some time constitutes tacit acceptance of responsibility for the fetus (Sumner 69).

Such considerations do not argue specifics or absolute standards, but call for mothers consid-

ering abortion to weigh ultimate consequences of their actions.

When we ask ourselves whether abortion should remain legal, we are essentially considering when a woman is morally justified in having an abortion. The Supreme Court's most famous decision regarding abortion was *Roe vs. Wade* in 1973. It ruled that an abortion was up to the mother and her doctor in the first trimester, could be reasonably regulated by state law in the second trimester, and could be prohibited except when the mother's health was at risk in the third trimester. Since then, there have been numerous court cases involving a variety of issues: whether abortions should be restricted to hospitals, whether consent is needed from a spouse or parent, whether government funding should be used for abortions, and how much information the mother needs to receive before making her decision to abort the fetus.

Examining the rights of the fetus and the rights of the mother can help us to understand the abortion conflict more fully. The anti-abortion movement assumes that the fetus has rights similar to those of any human being who can't fight for his or her rights. The pro-choice movement, however, is grounded in the liberal view that a woman has the right to control her own body through a pregnancy (Sumner, 47). Most people would agree that both the fetus and the mother have some rights, and the conflict arises when the rights of one are interfering with the rights of the other. If the mother has the right to happiness, and the fetus has the right to life, whose right takes priority if the woman needs an abortion to be happy? Does the fetus lose some of its rights in some cases because it is an "aggressor," even though only an innocent "aggressor?"

Since it is nearly impossible to determine whether

abortion is morally right or wrong, we must examine the effect of abortion on society and its individual members. Abortion eliminates life potential on a large scale. According to the Chicago Tribune on April 26, 1989, there were close to 1.6 million abortions in 1985. Nullification of life may seem unjust to the impending babies, but on a more worldly level abortions are helpful. The Earth's population growth is fast enough without all of those unwanted babies. Such babies may not contribute to society since many of them may be hindered throughout life due to lack of life, resources, or a healthy supportive family. We could raise the issue that some of those babies could have made a significant contribution to the world, but such speculation is unfair and irrelevant; we cannot go through life saying, "What if..." (unless we work for Hewlett Packard).

Abortions can hurt or help both the mothers and the fetuses. The termination of a pregnancy can mean increased freedom, relief, and a sense of control for the woman, but it can also bring great pain, shown in this anonymous testimony that appeared in New York Times in 1976:

It certainly does make more sense not to be having a baby right now—we say that to each other all the time. But I have this ghost now. A very little ghost that only appears when I'm seeing something beautiful...And the baby waves at me. And I wave at the baby. "Of course, we have room," I cry to the ghost. "Of course, we do" (Brown 108).

For the fetus, abortion certainly is the end of potential life, but it also can mean the end of a potential for great suffering and hardship.

As a society, we must accept a pro-choice attitude

regarding abortion. We are in doubt about when life begins, what life is, when abortion is justified if the law should endorse abortion, what the rights of the mother and the fetus are, and how abortion affects society. Some would argue that such doubt necessitates a conservative view of abortion: abortion is wrong because we must assume that life exists in a fetus just to be on the safe side. A less devastating solution is a pro-choice attitude. One does not have to be pro-abortion to be pro-choice; one must just be able to say, "Since I don't know, I'm not going to pretend to know the answer." We don't really know the amount of pain an abortion causes a fetus, but we do know of the pain an unwanted pregnancy can cause the mother and the fetus. We do know of the effects of illegalized abortion: forced marriages, abortions by back-alley doctors who profit greatly from unclean procedures, more pregnant teens terminating their education early, and attempts at spontaneous abortion by the mother. Denying a woman an abortion cannot be justified in moral or practical terms. We must uphold a woman's freedom to make her own decision regarding abortion, an issue to which we simply do not know the answer. We must follow Aristotle and value the virtue of humanity, not the simple cell division of a zygote that occurs in thousands of species.

Bibliography

Brown, Harold O.J. Death Before Birth. Nashville New York: Thomas Nelson Inc. 1977.

Elsasser, Glen. "High Court Faces Array of Options" Chicago Tribune April 26, 1989. 14.

Mappes, Thomas and Jane Zembaty. Social Ethics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1987.

Nathanson, Bernard N. Aborting America.

Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc. 1979.

Sumner, L.W. Abortion: Opposing Viewpoints. St. Paul, MN. Greenhaven Press. 1986.

Szumski, Bonne Editor. Abortion: Opposing Viewpoints. St. Paul, MN. Greenhaven Press, 1986.

Van, John and Peter Gerner. "Medical Gains Test Abortion Arguments". Chicago Tribune April 26, 1989. 1-14.

THE MORALITY OF ABORTION

By Carrie Nelson

The issue of legalized abortion in the United States has come to the forefront of current events as the Supreme Court begins to hear *Webster v. Reproductive Health Services*, a Missouri case that may lead to the reversal or modification of the 1973 case, *Roe v. Wade*, which legalized a woman's decision to terminate her pregnancy under almost any circumstances. Any change in the *Roe* decision will likely lead to extended battles in state legislatures. The debate over abortion shows no signs of cooling off and will demand in the upcoming months that every American take a stand on the issue. Said Gary Bauer, a former aide to Ronald Reagan who is now president of the Family Research Council, "Every once in a while the culture runs smack into an issue where it's impossible to find common ground... We either end slavery or not, we either get out of Vietnam or not" (Cawley 14). By examining the many facets of the abortion issue, one will see that the only ethical conclusion at which to arrive is that abortion on demand is wrong.

Central to the abortion question is a consideration of human life. As stated in a brief written for the Minnesota state legislature, "When human life exists, no matter what stage of its development, society must, for its own protection, recognize the right to that existence as a paramount right" (Hilgers 1). Recognition of fertilization as the beginning of human life would clearly show the unethical character of abortion. Conversely, if human life can be proven to begin elsewhere, then abortion is justified. Therefore, it is the question of when human life begins that is the crux of the abortion controversy. Medical evidence and common sense, combined with the weakness of the opposing arguments, prove that human life does indeed begin at fertilization.

At the First International Conference on Abortion, held in Washington, D.C. in October 1967, a group of biochemists, professors of obstetrics and gynecology, geneticists, and other scientists were brought together and were represented proportionately by discipline, race, and religion (e.g. 20% were Catholic). This was their almost unanimous conclusion:

The majority of our group could find no point in time between the union of sperm and egg, or at least the blastocyst stage, and the birth of the infant at which point we could say that this was a human life (Wilke 9).

The fertilized egg contains 46 chromosomes, 23 from the mother and 23 from the father. "The sex and genetic characteristics of the child that results from this union are determined at this very moment" (Hall 21). It is this unique genetic package, formed from the sex cells of two different people, that marks the humanity of this mass of cells. Common sense also dictates that the zygote is human. As John T. Noonan, professor of law at the University of California succinctly put it, "Anyone conceived by a man and a woman is human" (Mappes 11). Women give birth to farm animals and space aliens only in supermarket tabloids. Also, the zygote's guaranteed development into a mature being proves its humanity. When a skin cell reproduces, that new cell will die shortly after it reaches its potential as a skin cell but a human zygote, if conditions are conducive, will develop into a mature human being, much like the writer or reader of this paper.

This genetic package is more than simply a "blueprint" and does more than simply provide

the potential for life. A blueprint provides the instructions for building a house but once the house is materialized, the blueprint becomes dispensable and is thrown away. It has not become the house (Wilke 11). An acorn represents potential life but won't develop into anything until it is planted in the ground. Once it has sprouted, the plant may be called an oak tree, although it does not look like one, because it has started the continuous process of becoming one. The fertilized ovum is different from both these analogies because it is a human being. The fetus, at any time after conception, has intact all the materials for a mature person. Nothing will be added.

Thus it can be said that the individual is whoever he is going to become from the moment of impregnation. Thereafter, his subsequent development may be described as a process of becoming the one he already is. Genetics teaches that we were from the beginning what we essentially still are in every cell and in every human and individual attribute (Dedek 65).

The fact that human life is a process of becoming makes us all, in ethicist Paul Ramsey's words, "fellow fetuses" (Dedek 65). The scientists who met in 1967 at the Washington think tank confirm this continuum.

The changes occurring between implantation, a six-weeks embryo, a six months fetus, a one-week-old child, or a mature adult are merely stages of development and maturation (Wilke 9).

The argument for life at conception is strengthened by the weakness of the opposing arguments. All attempts to place the beginning of life at a point other than at fertilization are purely arbitrary and have serious flaws. There is no magical granting of life that occurs when the fetus can suck its thumb, or can be viewed outside the

womb, or can read a book.

Viability is a popular argument for denying the humanity of the fetus. Medical technology has advanced to such a degree that a fetus's ability to live outside the womb has been pushed farther back toward fertilization. A new medical subspecialty, called neonatology, has developed in the last two decades. It focuses on saving the lives of premature infants (Van 14). The perfection of medical techniques will likely push the viability date even farther back. Also, every fetus develops at a different rate and is able to live outside the womb at a different point (Mappes 9). Any factor that is as changing and difficult to determine as viability is an unreliable base for an argument. Another flaw in the viability argument is that dependence is not ended when a fetus leaves the womb. Even a young child is completely dependent on another's care and would die if neglected. Therefore, "The unsubstantial lessening in dependence at viability does not seem to signify any special acquisition of humanity" (Mappes 9).

Other reasons for denying the humanity of the fetus are equally faulted, and in some cases, dangerous lines of thought. The idea that the fetus does not "look human" or is "too small to be human" gives undue credibility to our sense of sight. Saying that a being that does not look like us and is, therefore, not human gives rise to racial discrimination (Mappes 10). Judging a fetus's humanity on whether it can communicate or function in society is indicative of a culture that judges the value of a life on what that life can produce. Logically, such a society would also condone the termination of the lives of the elderly, handicapped, and insane. Perhaps the most dangerous rationale denying a fetus's humanity is that because it is so small and un-babylike, the developing fetus has not evoked any strong feelings in the parents and its death can go un-grieved. Throughout history certain peoples have had difficulty feeling compassion for other groups

they feel are less human than they (Mappes 10). Simply because the Romans felt no remorse for killing their slaves or because the Nazis did not mourn the death of six million Jews, their positions are not any more defensible.

Myriad legal, philosophical, medical and social arguments further discredit the pro-abortion position. It simply comes down to this: Once a fetus is granted humanity (as it must be after conception), he or she must be guaranteed full rights as a United States citizen under the 14th Amendment. This places the fetus's right to life on the same level as the mother's right to privacy. Just as a white's rights have no precedence over a black's, a mother's rights may not interfere with her child's, be he born or unborn. It follows that if the fetus is a human, abortion is a subjugation of that person's rights and therefore unconstitutional.

Bibliography

Cawley, Janet. "The Stakes Are High, And So Are Emotions." Chicago Tribune 26 April 1989: 14.

Dedek, John F. Human Life. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1972.

Hall, Robert E., M.D. A Medical Guide For Pregnant Women. New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1963.

Hilgers, Thomas W., M.D. and Robert P.N. Shearin, M.D. Induced Abortion: A Documented Report. St. Paul, MN.: 1972.

Mappes, Thomas, and Jane Zembaty. Social Ethics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1987.

Salholz, Eloise, Ann McDaniel, and Sue Hutchison. "Pro-Choice: 'A Sleeping Giant' Awakes." Newsweek 24 April 1989: 39-40.

Van, Jon, and Peter Gorner. "Medical Gains Test

Abortion Arguments." Chicago Tribune 26 April 1989: 1.

Wilke, Dr. and Mrs. J.C., The Abortion Handbook. Cincinnati, Ohio: Hayes Publishing Co., 1979.

VIVA IN VITRO!

By Emily Hall

Aldous Huxley's brave new world may not be as far away as his first readers might have thought. The simple question "where do babies come from?" does not always have the simple answer it once did. In vitro fertilization is one of the processes that has complicated the issue of technology and procreation.

When I was first confronted with the idea of in vitro fertilization (IVF), I supported it immediately. It seemed a completely beneficial concept: a medical advancement that could help infertile couples have a child of their own. Unfortunately, IVF is not that simple. I still support the process. There are, however, many other factors and future issues which entangle the technique in controversy.

"In the broadest terms, science has given us three new inventions: synthetic children, synthetic families, and synthetic sex. The first, fetal manipulation and experimentation, is a threat to human dignity. The second...is a threat to the family. The third...is a threat to sexuality." This is a quote taken from a strongly anti-IVF article in *The New Republic* by Charles Krauthammer. Because I am Catholic, I was curious about the position of the church on this issue. I found Krauthammer's opinions extremely narrow and frustrating. He felt that this was a "Frankenstein world" we are approaching. I do admit that the idea of creating children without the act of sexual intercourse seems somewhat sterile and unfeeling. Yet, the process of IVF can be mentally and somewhat physically difficult. Any couple who is willing to spend the time, money, and effort to create a baby by in vitro fertilization obviously desires a child. Maybe the child was not created through "natural" means. The way it

enters into the world is very natural and the world it enters probably could not be more loving.

Secondly, Krauthammer insists that IVF is a threat to family and sexuality. The threat to family seems completely unreasonable in light of my argument above. To want a child, to start a family, is what drives couples to such extreme measures. As for the threat to sexuality, that is hardly likely. Sexual desires are, at a basic level, primal. Humans won't stop sharing sexual intimacy just because a percentage of infertile couples create children by IVF or artificial insemination. Even in Huxley's sterile, cold world, sex was still an important part of people's lives.

Much of Krauthammer's and other theologians' sentiment was influenced by the attitudes of Pope Pius XII. His stand against artificial insemination was decidedly inflexible. In his words, "procreativity is the intention of nature inscribed in the organs and their functions". This returns to the argument: is everything that is "natural" correct and everything "unnatural" incorrect? From his statement I would infer this to be correct. Yet the main reason why medicine exists is to help when our bodies cannot manage. Artificial organs and organ transplants have saved thousands of lives but these were not "God given organs". In the same sense, IVF is not wrong just because it is artificial. Infertile people were not given the same healthy organs of normal human beings. We have not figured out a way to reconstruct damaged fallopian tubes or cure impotency. In the meantime, IVF is the best solution.

The modern Vatican repeats the views of Pope Pius XII. In a report to the Ethics Committee of the American Fertility Society it wrote, "In pur-

suit of the admirable end of helping an infertile couple to conceive and have their baby, IVF intervenes in their supreme expression of mutual love. It separates "baby-making" from "love-making". A group of atheists renamed the report, "Sex Tips for Modern Girls from 60-year-old Bachelors Who Have Taken Vows of Chastity". This rather humorous title demonstrates the irony of the Vatican's position. These men have dedicated their lives to upholding Christianity as they think best. Yet, they do not necessarily feel the yearning of motherhood or the pain of a childless marriage. Is the Vatican really the best authority on how to handle this issue?

I have spent much time discussing religion and its involvement within vitro ethics because, despite the fact that many people are not as devoutly religious as their ancestors were, Christianity is still the moral foundation of the Western world. The attitudes of the Catholic and other Christian churches have had an obvious impact on such controversial issues as abortion and birth control.

Yet, their objections are not always heeded; fertility clinics are flourishing in Australia, Britain, and the United States. As a result of the success of IVF and strong support from the media, people have become very aware of the process and its possibilities. This is where many of the moral dilemmas have arisen. Recently fertility clinics have been confronted with many kinds of requests concerning IVF such as: "donor sperm, donor ova, donor embryo, surrogate mothers, surrogate carriers, single women, lesbian couples, frozen sperm, frozen embryos...."

To examine all of these issues could take hundreds of pages. Yet, these issues are important. They are intertwined with IVF.

With each issue, different and additional opposition arises against IVF. There are still many supporters of in vitro fertilization, however. I

have discovered an ardent advocate, Peter Singer, writing for Technology Review. Two important issues he discusses are the rights of embryos and the role of women in IVF. I agree with him on both points.

First, in the last few years fertilization specialists have discovered the benefits of freezing embryos in liquid nitrogen. Because IVF does not always work on the first try, couples who do not freeze embryos must go through the complicated process of harvesting eggs and taking hormones for many months in a row if they wish to try again. If liquid nitrogen is used instead, all the eggs are fertilized, one is implanted, and the rest are frozen, ready to be used in the next few attempts if the first is not successful. Many questions arise, however. If the implantation is successful, what should be done with the remaining embryos? Should they be destroyed? Used for experimentation? Many pro-life activists have become involved in the fight to protect embryo rights. For many people the thought of destroying potential life seems the ultimate sin and the ultimate insult to human dignity. Singer challenges this view: "In terms of its actual characteristics, the newly conceived embryo ranks very low. Unlike dogs, pigs, chickens, and other animals, it has no brain or nervous system and is presumably quite incapable of feeling pain or anything else."

Embryo protectionists also argue that to destroy an embryo is to destroy a potential human being. This is true. Yet, an egg and a sperm also have this same potential. No one is ever particularly upset about their destruction.

This issue does not have an easy answer. Embryo freezing, now such an important part of IVF, does so much good. In church recently, I delivered the first reading which states, "Now the Lord has spoken who formed me as his servant from the womb" (Is 49:3.5-6, underlining mine). I interpret this to mean that Christian values are pres-

ent in Christian people at their birth and throughout their lives. Many people in the parish, however, will probably read it to mean from conception. It is difficult to bridge a belief in science and a belief in God. In my opinion, however, bringing children into the world to love and nurture them, whether they are conceived in a petri dish or in a human being, is a truly Christian (or at least beautiful) action. The fate of extra embryos should not put a stop to the possibilities IVF holds.

The second issue that Singer explores is the future role of women as a result of IVF. Robyn Rowland, an Australian sociologist, writes, "Ultimately the new technology will be used for the benefit of men and to the detriment of women. Although technology itself is not always a negative development, the real question has always been who controls it. Biological technology is in the hands of men." She predicts a world, similar to Margaret Atwood's world in The Handmaid's Tale, where women are merely "vessels" for bearing children, made pregnant by IVF. For a few seconds the idea frightened me, and then I came to realize that this is extremely unlikely. Before the Civil War, many Americans felt that freed slaves would rise up and destroy the white population. This, of course, has never occurred. It has taken many years, but we are on the road to a more racially integrated society. Americans adapted to the changes in society then, just as the people of the world can adapt to processes such as in vitro fertilization.

Finally, I would like to close by retelling a story I read in People magazine: Paul D'Alessandro had only been married a year-and-a-half when he suffered an industrial accident that made him a paraplegic for life. It also left him unable to have children...or so he thought. A new medical technique was used to collect a sperm sample from D'Alessandro and a year later his wife was pregnant by in vitro fertilization. They now have a son-something they never thought could happen.

This story does not seem to be racked with controversy. It has a wonderful, happy ending. The possibility of creating a child-even if it is done in a medical lab-is the basic reason I support in vitro fertilization.

Bibliography

Plummer, William. People Weekly April 4, 1988. V29, p70(2).

Krauthammer, Charles. The New Republic, May 4, 1987. V196, p17(5).

Singer, Peter. Technology Review, March 1985. V88, p22(9).

Note: The three articles listed above are the three I evaluated in my paper. The other articles listed are ones I read for background information

Nelson, Robert J. The Christian Century, Jan. 27, 1984. V99, p78(5).

Lieber, James. The Atlantic, June 1989. p76(5).

Greenwald, Julie. People Weekly, May 30, 1988. p46(6).

Artic Press, Newsweek, July 2, 1984, p54(1).

McKormick, Richard A. America, V153, Sept. 7, 1985, p396(8).

A PRICELESS CHILD THE ULTIMATE CONSUMER PRODUCT

By Cybele Seifert

The practice of surrogate motherhood has become the subject of emotional debate and national concern. Media coverage of the Baby M custody battle enlightened the general public about the legal and medical technicalities involving surrogate mothers as well as the moral dilemmas posed by surrogacy. Surrogate mothers have literally loaned out their bodies for reproductive use. This practice should be banned because it shows a wanton disregard for both women and the contracted child who gets passed around. This issue serves as a prime example of a technology which has outpaced our current moral capacity.

A woman who agrees to be inseminated with the husband's sperm and then carry the baby to term is a surrogate mother. At birth she relinquishes the baby for adoption by the man and his wife. The process of artificial insemination is a simple one that has somewhat crudely been likened to turkey basting. A syringe is used to deposit the sperm directly into the uterus. Thus the baby being created is the biological child of the sperm-donating father and the surrogate mother. The legal contracts which regulate this practice largely ignore this fact. The language in the contracts suggests that the wife of the actual father has as much of a right to rear the child as does the surrogate mother. The reality is that legally the social mothers of children born out of "surrogacy" contracts are just one divorce away from childlessness (Rothman 24).

The technology to perform embryo transfers, and

have them result in viable pregnancies, has not yet been developed. An embryo transfer is the procedure used to place a living embryo into a woman's uterus. The embryo may be a product of in vitro fertilization with the wife's egg and her husband's sperm; or it may be an embryo washed from the womb of the surrogate. Thus disputes over the child after birth take the form of custody battles as in the case of Baby M.

The concept of surrogate mothers was first introduced in the Bible as evidenced in Genesis 16. In this biblical tale, Sarah and Abraham chose Hagar to be the surrogate mother of Ishmael. Sentimental adoption created an unprecedented demand for infants in the 1920's and 1930's. It is important to note that, "By the 1930's, lower-class children joined their middle-class counterparts in a new nonproductive world of childhood, a world in which the sanctity and emotional value of a child made child labor taboo" (Rothman 24). Previously, children over the age of ten were preferred as in the case of nineteenth-century foster families. Pictorial Review signaled changing perceptions when it touted infant adoption to be the latest American fad in 1937 (Rothman). The "ideal" child of that era was exactly the same as the "ideal" surrogate product of today: a white healthy baby of English or Northern European descent. Blue eyes and blond curly hair were and are definite assets. Then babies were imported from London. Today people are paying thousands of dollars for special order babies. Yet the National Committee for Adoption estimates that a minimum of 36,000 hard-to-place children

cannot find an adoptive home. These children are overlooked because they are sick, disturbed, black, or too old (Rothman 28). How can people sell human beings and at the same time leave others to spend time in institutions? Now candidates for surrogate mothers are being pursued across the country at college campuses and in predominantly lower-middle class towns. The tragedy of this whole baby market concept is only that the "ideal" child is pursued or produced on demand, while children outside the mainstream have remained unwanted by adoptive couples throughout history.

The average surrogate mother receives a ten-thousand dollar fee for carrying the contracted baby to full term. Her medical expenses are completely covered by the couple who requests her services. This sum seems to be a profit, but she can't work outside the home during a large chunk of the pregnancy. Paying a woman to bear a child goes back to the 1930's and 1940's in this country. There was a black market for babies at that time, and it was a seller's market. Mothers of unwanted children were approached by entrepreneurial brokers. These brokers offered to pay medical and hospital expenses and often a bonus in exchange for the baby (Rothman 25).

These arguments are not being presented to compare the evils of baby selling to the evils of surrogate mothers. "The concept of surrogate mothers is far worse than baby selling! A surrogate mother is expected to deliver the ultimate consumer product. She is carefully screened so that the natural father will have the most healthy, beautiful, and intelligent child possible. The issue isn't simply that parents want a child to love or a biologically related child to carry on the family line. Surrogacy, in summary, is the deliberate manufacture of a suitable child (Rothman).

The issue of contracts and specific stipulations shows a perversion and a lack of respect for the surrogate mother and her body. Mary Beth Whitehead's contract was typical of the one many surrogate mothers have. It had provisions for amniocentesis and obligatory abortion if Mr. Stern, the biological father, did not like the results of the test. If Baby M had been miscarried or stillborn, Mary Beth Whitehead would have received only an undisclosed small fee for her troubles (Neuhaus 8). Whitehead suffered from a distorted perception of reality thanks in part to the contract. She said, "It's such a miracle to see a child born." That's an odd comment: she seemed to be neglecting the fact that she had just experienced that birth. Even women's smaller daily rights shouldn't be overlooked. "Many surrogate contracts include health habit clauses -against cigarette smoking, consuming alcohol, and taking nonprescription drugs. In a sense, the surrogate signs away her right to independent action-to toast a friend's promotion, or pop a cold tablet, say-to manufacture a better product. Obligating a woman to subordinate her needs to those of the infant she's gestating changes a nurturing relationship to an adversarial one: "the fetus holds the mother hostage" (Asnes 386). Embryo rights shouldn't precede those of the mother.

Free choice on the natural mother's part is thus subjugated to the contract. Women are exploited by the physician-attorney teams who regulate the contracts and clinics. In both cases women enter the "arrangement" as free agents but, of course, they don't remain in control of their destiny for long. One lawyer famous for dealing with surrogate mothers referred to himself as a "pioneer" and a "champion of breeders", whom he called "surrogate mothers" (Corea 245). He apparently claims that his \$7,500 fee does not

guarantee a baby or that a surrogate would abide by the given contract.

By selling human beings we are leaving our society open to many evils. Something is wrong when we sell children or give them away in the same manner as kittens and cars. The concept of maternal bonds becomes shattered. Women are bonded to their children from the start because they grow inside of them. The idea of a woman bonding to a child after birth is a man's perception. The main evil is the plan to recruit poor women from the United States and Third World countries such as Central America to become surrogate mothers. Some proponents of surrogacy hope this market will yield a pool of cheap labor. They figure these women might accept fees as low as \$2,000. Thus they feel as surrogacy becomes more commonplace, prices will be slashed in half (Corea 245). Such plans of seeking out women who will breed babies because they need to survive wipes out the notion that women will serve as surrogate mothers in the future for altruistic reasons. The lot of these women would be very similar to black American women who had their children sold away from them.

Hiring a womb and raging about exploitation have been the focus thus far. Some couples do seek out surrogate mothers for very legitimate reasons. Stopping the genetic disease of a particular spouse is a motive for many couples. In one case, a couple didn't want to risk having a child with neurofibromatosis which is a genetic neurological disorder. Spouses who are in the age range of thirty-six to forty are sometimes considered already too old to be adoptive parents. One out of six couples experience fertility problems. Couples who can't conceive due to idiopathic infertility are said to experience the Elizabeth Kubler-Ross stages of grief.

Certainly there are legitimate demands for this industry - it is not just a matter of career women not wanting stretch marks. We live in a capitalist society. Who is to say upper-class people can't buy themselves custom made children? Some surrogate mothers are quite eager to share their womb. Some women claim to enjoy being pregnant for its own sake or they could use the extra money. Others feel that ushering in new life that would not otherwise have existed somehow makes up for a past abortion.

Despite appeals to the virtues of capitalism, surrogate motherhood should be banned. This has already been done in California. Both women and the children being created are disregarded in the process. Children cannot be assigned a monetary value and women can't rent out this womb without giving up many legal rights, not to mention their pride. The contracts that govern these arrangements exacerbate class conflicts. This issue affects society as a whole and not just women. People should be celebrated for their uniqueness and shortcomings. Manipulating human genetics while thousands of unwanted, unclaimed children are born each year is "criminal".

Bibliography

Asnes, Marion. "The Legal Angle," Vogue August 1985: 386-387.

Corea, Gena The Mother Machine. New York: Harper & Row, 1985.

Halpern, Sue. "Infertility: Playing the Odds," Ms February 1989: 145-156.

Neuhaus, Richard John. "Renting Woman, Buying Babies, and Class Struggles," Society

March-April 1988: 8-10.

Perloe, Mark., and Linda Gail Christie. Miracle Babies & Other Happy Endings. New York: Rawson Associates, 1986.

Rothman, Barbara Katz. "Cheap Labor: Sex, Class, Race - and 'Surrogacy,'" Society. March-April 1988: 21-28

Thom, Mary. "Dilemmas of the New Birth Technologies," Ms. May 1988: 70.

THE ENGLISH PARLIAMENTARY REVOLT: A RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL CONFLICT

By Andrew Boies

Ever since the development of the theory of economic history by Karl Marx, there has been a tendency to attribute many historical events to the pressures of the economy and the struggles between classes. However, when examining the English Civil War, a Marxist interpretation does not properly explain the events or the motivations on both sides.

The struggle between the House of Commons and the Monarchy, which began shortly after the death of Elizabeth I and the crowning of James I, was primarily a legal and religious struggle, where the two opposing viewpoints attempted to find support for their position in the annals of British legal history (Churchill 179-180). The Parliamentary forces, led by Sir Edward Coke, derived many of their arguments from the medieval traditions of the Lancastrian kings. James I and Charles I both had ample precedent for their point of view, which espoused the doctrine of the Royal Prerogative and the "divine right" of kings, especially from recent English history (Churchill 179-180). The division was clearly stated by Parliamentary Lt. Gen. Edward Ludlow: "The question in dispute between us and the King's party was...whether the King should govern as a god by his will [or] the nation be governed by laws made by themselves and live under a government from their own consent" (Young 31). Even religious fanatic Oliver Cromwell tended to dwell on legal distinctions while trying to put the King on trial (Wedgewood 23).

These divisions were exacerbated by several factors. For one, James I, a firm believer in the divine right of Kings, initially had almost no knowledge of the English legal system, and at one

point ordered a thief hanged without a trial, purely on the basis of kingly say-so in clear violation of legal precedent (Churchill 148). Secondly, with the fall of Spain as a major power, England was in significantly less danger of outside military interference. The greatest danger of another attempt to re-Catholicize England seemed to come from James himself, who was the son of Mary Queen of Scots, and who expended great effort to attempt to marry his son Charles into the Spanish royal family. Also, Parliament, after years of domination by Elizabeth I, was in a mood to regain some of its power. One of its first acts was to state what it felt its rights were in a formal "apology" to the King.

At the heart of the conflict between the King and Parliament was religion. Religion became a part of the battle when the Parliament, after being defeated on the "Ship Money" issue in a legal battle, realized that it would have to make religion an issue to prevail over the King. Later, Charles stirred up religious tensions over his attempt to mandate church attendance during his "Personal Rule." The Puritans considered this persecution. Later, when he attempted to make the sacrament of the Lord's Supper more elaborate, he was widely accused in Scotland of moving towards Roman Catholicism, an assertion that was supported by the existence of Charles' Catholic wife (Wedgewood 18). Charles I also released a new prayer book that greatly offended the Scots. The combination of all these factors led Charles to be the target of great anti-Catholic outbursts among the Protestants of England, especially the Puritans. Charles was attacked and executed as much for religious reasons as political ones.

Charles went calmly to his death after rejecting multiple attempts at negotiation, also for religious reasons. As a believer in the divine right of kings, Charles could not simply step down. He believed that he had received his authority from God, and to deny his calling would be a grave sin (Churchill 232). He was far more willing to die than to defy God and face the consequences.

Religion reached its paramount importance with the emergence of Oliver Cromwell. This Parliamentary General, and eventual Lord Protector of England, had experienced a religious conversion while in his thirties, and lived by the word of God. While obviously brilliant, he described all his opinions and thought as visions or religious experiences (Churchill 232). His letters to other members of Parliament seeking his advice are laden with statements telling them to seek their answers in God. His later consolidation of power involved expelling the Presbyterian factions of Parliament from the House of Commons, and eventually setting up a government that banned all activities not in accordance with the Puritan religion. Cromwell took what began as a political battle during the reign of James I and turned it into a religious purge. Cromwell's beliefs also led him to believe that there was no other option to executing the King. Both Cromwell and Charles believed that they were doing God's bidding.

Many of the conflicts between the Stuart Monarchs and Parliament seemingly centered around money. Monetary matters triggered many of the events of the period, including Charles' need to call Parliament for the second time after his long period of "Personal Rule." However important money appeared, it was not a driving force, but rather a tool. Parliament used money as the ultimate King controlling device. For example, early in Charles' reign, Parliament forced him to acknowledge the superiority of Acts of Parliament to Royal Prerogative in exchange for money to fight wars against Spain and France's Cardinal Richelieu. The real issue remained a political

and legal one, a fight over how England would be ruled. For example, the debate over Charles' leveling of "Ship Money" taxes revolved not around the actual tax, but around the King's authority to tax at all.

Class distinctions were also of lesser importance than a Marxist historian would like. When the battle lines were drawn at the beginning of the Civil War, they were mainly religious and political divisions, not economic ones. Cromwell's army was made up of wealthy landowners like himself, as well as what Cromwell called "plain russet-coated captains" (Churchill 232). As in the American Civil War, individual families were often broken apart and fought on different sides of the war (Wedgewood 4). Although more aristocrats tended to side with the royalist, by no means all swayed in that direction. The division was greater among the lower classes, which split down the middle (Wedgewood 16).

In the final analysis, there is very little support for the position that the English Civil War was caused by economic and class differences. The political and religious issues far outweighed any monetary concerns.

Bibliography

Churchill, Winston S. A History of the English Speaking Peoples Volume Two. The New World. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1956.

Wedgewood, C.V. A Coffin For King Charles: The Trial and Execution of Charles I New York: The MacMillan Company, 1964.

Young, Peter, Oliver Cromwell. Essex: Anchor Press Ltd., 1975.

THE RISE OF ENGLISH CAPITALISM AND THE CIVIL WAR

By Brian Ruder

It is unusual in history for an event to have one overwhelming cause without which it is certain that the event would not have occurred. For instance, it is doubtful that there would have been an American civil war if conflict had not arisen about the issue of slavery. It is difficult to trace the origins of the English civil war, and ever since its beginning in 1642, its causes have been the object of much controversy. Usually the war has been attributed to political and/or religious motives, yet, until recently, the economic aspects of the war have been largely put off as being secondary, only augmenting the main causes. However, though ideology, whether political or religious, was a main factor in causing the Parliamentary uprising, material interests and class struggles also played a great part, perhaps the largest part, in pushing the revolt in England.

Thomas Babington Macaulay provided an excellent example of the purely political, anti-monarchical interpretation of the war. England, according to Macaulay, was reaching a crisis point in politics from which either the king or the Parliament would emerge as dominant. James I frightened Parliament with despotic words, but he really didn't do anything to spark outright opposition. Charles I, however, acted on his autocratic ambitions. He began to levy heavy taxes throughout England, including an unusual demand of "ship money" during peacetime. The Parliamentary leaders believed that the aim of these taxes was to raise a standing army—the one instrument that stood between Charles and absolute monarchy. This was unacceptable, and

hence so were Charles' money-raising efforts. Parliament rose up in opposition, raised an army and defeated the despot king. (Macaulay 1-10).

Though this theory seems very simple and clear, it ignores too many aspects of the revolution to be adequate. Professor Robert Ashton explained the basic reason why a deeper approach must be taken.

It would be absurd to suggest that constitutional ideas per se could have attracted such wide support if they had not been intimately connected with man's material interests (Ashton 105).

The basic economic interpretation was originally presented by R.H. Tawney. He believed that the gentry was the key class in orchestrating the civil war, a widely held view among economic historians, including Christopher Hill and Robert Ashton. The gentry was the dominant force in the House of Commons and was rapidly rising in power and number. Tawney and Hill attribute a change in the gentry's lifestyle to a change in the economic structure of Britain. Inflation was on the rise and it wreaked havoc with the incomes of the landed gentry. As the money received from those who simply used their land for profit by letting others use it came in fixed amounts, that money became less valuable while its supply to the landowner remained the same. Hence the gentry began to develop into a more capitalist class. No longer could the "passive landowner" be expected to keep up with the rising standards

of the day. Instead, the "agricultural capitalist", or the landowner who used land for investment, set the pace of the economy. It became possible for a man to be economically powerful as a landowner without any other income if he were a wise businessman. Thus, the economy was shifting assuredly towards capitalism and away from the traditional feudal system upheld by the monarchy. The inflation in England was also creating problems for Charles. Now in need of more revenue, he found that his sources of income were unresponsive to the changing value of the currency. Not only was the monarchy perhaps the largest "passive landowner", but additional revenue was fixed also, such as, tonnage and poundage duties and traditional feudal dues. Thus, in order to benefit from the rising capitalism in England, Charles attempted to "graft" himself onto it. He tried to raise revenue in several ways, such as peacetime demand of ship money, the monopolization of new industries, and stricter enforcement of the payment of feudal dues. In so doing, Charles attempted to preserve the feudal structure of Britain by making it an integral part of the rising capitalism. The rest of the feudal aristocracy found itself in the same bind and was forced to become increasingly dependent on loans from the capitalists. Unfortunately for Charles, feudal and capitalist societies were diametrically opposed and his efforts, along with the aristocracy's leechlike dependence, only led to conflict. As Tawney said, "it was discovered...that, as a method of foreclosure, war was cheaper than litigation" (36). The country divided down class lines, with the feudal aristocracy becoming royalists, and the capitalist gentry, merchant classes, and lower classes forming their opposition (Hill 11-19, Tawney 32-42 Ashton, 93-110).

Not all economic historians agree with the

"Tawney School." Hugh Trevor-Roper, for example, is believed to hold an almost entirely opposite view. He believes that Tawney's statistics, displaying the improving economic position of the gentry, are flawed in that they assume only office-holding gentry. These office-holding gentry would have other primary sources of income besides land-based revenue. Instead, the "mere gentry" (as Trevor-Roper calls them), or those gentry without income other than land were in a state of economic decline. These poorer gentry saw the government going into the hands of capitalists, and thus saw their futures threatened even more. Instead of a rising capitalist class rebelling against a feudal society, Trevor-Roper takes the view that a discontented segment of feudal society blindly acted to prevent rising capitalist power. The gentry did not know what they wanted, but only that they didn't want capitalism. A weak monarchy was seen as an opening for capitalist control and the weak gentry made war to prevent capitalist domination. In this sense, the revolution failed (Trevor-Roper 42-48).

However, too much is assumed to say that the entire civil war was simply a blind revolt. Though perhaps such an idea couldn't really be proven false, it seems that it could easily be combined with other interpretations. For instance, if the poorer gentry were so irrational in their actions, it seems entirely reasonable that they could end up fighting with men who believed that they were fighting for capitalism. Hence, multiple and sometimes conflicting motives merged to create an overwhelming opposition force to Charles' government. Additionally, though Tawney attributes most of the support for capitalism to the "agricultural capitalist" alone, Hill broadens his interpretation to include all of the gentry who had inherent interests in the rising

capitalism, including those who held office. This interpretation seems to be the most reasonable.

An important question arises when discussing the economic aspects of the war. What part did religion play after all? J. H. Hexter wrote that the "Puritans had to flee from the Laudian regime, or fight it." (67). But once again, as with the political and constitutional issues, one must look deeper into these religious motives. Primarily, as Christopher Hill pointed out, religion was an issue that dominated everyone's life in 18th Century England. Since the church was so important, the presiding ruler had to control it to control the people. The same reason explains why the revolutionaries had to go through the church to get rid of the existing rule. Thus, "social conflicts inevitably become religious conflicts" (Hill 14). Additionally, each class in England chose a religion to suit its needs. "Men come to believe in the ideology which they have subconsciously adopted because of its apparent harmony with their material interests," (Ashton 106). Puritanism was seen by the capitalist elite as serving their purposes well. They were the "elect" and the non-elect formed the proletariat beneath them. Puritanism was also the dominant religion in England opposite Anglicanism and the autocratic Archbishop Laud's regime with its increasing tithes. Thus, it was convenient to cover up economic and political protests with religious qualms. To further the idea that the religious conflicts in 1642 were more than ideology, Richard Baxter pointed out that he who was interested in wealth donned a favorable religion in order to preserve his reputation and quiet his conscience. It can be fairly said that religion was the major reason why the lower classes fought in the war. They had practically no material interests in it, and perhaps would be hurt economically by rising capitalism, but they

sincerely felt that they were waging God's war. As Austin Woolrych stated, to those classes the idea of "church-democracy" was closely linked to the idea of "state-democracy". Hence, they merged their religious motives with the political ones of their leaders. Perhaps G.E. Aylmer is correct in his argument that the lower classes simply had great local loyalties, and thus supported their particular county's representative in the House of Commons. Either way, the lower classes were drawn into the war after the gentry, with their influence in parliament, began it. (Hill 11-19, Baxter 29-32, Hexter 48-59, Woolrych 59-78, Aylmer 41-46).

The debate over the causes of the English civil war will continue for some time to come. As Robert Ashton admits, each author's interpretation of the war is influenced by whatever time period in which he is writing. Politics, religion, and economics all played great parts in spurring the so-called "Puritan Revolution". No one will ever know if the parliamentary forces would have had enough momentum to defeat Charles had any one of these causalities been eliminated. Regardless, economic motives played a decisively key role in creating the impetus for revolt. Not only did they push many people of England to rebel, but they were also behind many of the religious and political motivations of the revolutionaries. Hence, though many Marxist historians are criticized as being too determined to find class struggles in historical events, in the case of the English civil war they certainly have a strong case (Ashton 93-110).

Bibliography

Ashton, quoted in Parry, R.H. The English Civil War and After. Berkley: U Cal Press, 1970.

Aylmer, G.E. Rebellion or Revolution? New York: Opus, 1986.

Baxter, Richard. "A Moderate Puritan Looks at the Extreme Policies of Sinful Men", Taylor, Philip, Editor, The Origins of the English Civil War. Lexington: Heath, 1960.

Hexter, J.H. "The Wealthy Parliamentary Gentry and The Reality of Ideology", Taylor, Philip, Editor, The Origins of the English Civil War. Lexington: Heath, 1960.

Hill, Christopher. "The English Bourgeoisie Revolution: A Marxist Interpretation", Taylor, Philip, Editor The Origins of the English Civil War Heath, 1960.

Macaulay, Thomas B. "Liberty Versus Despotism: The Classic Whig Statement", Taylor, Philip, Editor The Origins of the English Civil War Lexington: Heath, 1960.

Parry, R.H. The English Civil War and After Berkley: U. Cal Press, 1970.

Tawney, Richard H., "The Gentry Takes the Power to Which Their Economic Success Entitles them" Taylor, Philip, Editor. The Origins of the English Civil War. Lexington: Heath 1960.

Taylor, Philip, Editor. The Origins of the English Civil War Lexington: Heath, 1960.

Trevor-Roper, Hugh R. "Poor and Discontented Gentry Rebel Against Established Institutions", Taylor, Philip, Editor The Origins of the English Civil War Lexington: Heath, 1960.

Woolrych quoted in Parry, R.H. The English Civil War and After Berkley: U Cal Press 1970.

ON MARX'S HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

By Luke Jacob

"Any day now, any day now, I shall be released..."
Bob Dylan

World economics and politics of the twentieth century have been dominated overwhelmingly by two very different systems and ideologies. The system of "capitalistic democracy", as exemplified by the United States, and the broad system of socialistic "communism", as employed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and much of the Eurasian world, have constantly clashed for domination of the world economic and political scene. The origin of the massive system called communism lies with a man named Karl Marx, who through his own studies (both alone and with his collaborator Friedrich Engels) and by applying philosophies of the German philosopher, G.W.F. Hegel, developed his own brand of socialism, which he dubbed "communism", and a set of philosophies and ideas to go with it.

The ideal of Marx's communism is a society in which everyone is a working man on equal terms with everyone else, with every individual working for a common goal, which is the survival and improvement of the whole. Not only did Marx believe that such a society was possible, he reasoned on the basis of his theories and those of others like Hegel that the capitalist world in which he lived was moving inexorably and inevitably towards just such a society. Marx based his theory that the ultimate goal of history is a communistic society of working people on a concept known as historical materialism. Historical materialism has two basic components: the idea of the dialectic as applied to history; and the idea that the economic substructure of society, as brought about by the workings of the two forces of the dialectic, is the basis of the societal super-

structure, consisting of the "religion, ethics, laws, and institutions" of society (Hunt 62).

The first piece of the puzzle of Marx's historical materialism is the idea of the dialectic. This idea states that, in the search for knowledge, there are countless theses (statements of ideas), to which correspond countless antitheses (Rossiter 29-30). Eventually the conflicts of the theses and antitheses of history were pushing events, in an understandable and definable pattern, towards some great "Absolute Idea" (Rossiter 30). Marx went along with the idea of the dialectic and with applying it to history, but he was a man of practicalities and realities, not of absolutes and ideas, and thus he did not believe that history is constantly moving towards some "Absolute Idea".

Exhibiting the new "toughness of mind" characteristic of many nineteenth century thinkers, Marx was very practical in his reasoning. He concluded that all human relations are directed towards the one end which all men strive for, this being the "production of the means to support life" (Hunt, p. 61). Realistically, to Marx, man's principal object is to survive, and this desire supersedes all else—all morals, religions, and ideas of justice. And since the production of the means to support life is so important, so then is the exchange of those things produced vital. Under this supposition, the basis of all society, and all history, is essentially economic.

Here is where the dialectic comes into play in Marx's philosophy. Changes in the productive forces of society, the relations between men and their instruments of production, lead to necessary changes in relations between men and other men, i.e. productive relations (Hunt 61). Marx

suggested that productive relations in a primitive society were essentially cooperative, but that at some point along the line a few members of society gained control over productive forces. This gave one sector of society power over the rest, causing a situation of animosity between the two groups. Thus arose the two opposing forces of Marx's historical dialectic—the class in power will always be in conflict with the class aspiring to power, and since this latter class will by necessity of such a relationship be oppressed, the two classes will never resolve their disagreements without some sort of drastic change. These changes occur through great revolutions, during which society progresses by quick “leaps or jumps” (Rossite 32). The steady progress of history plods along in preparation for the time at which one of these leaps of revolution will occur, and the time does inevitably come. It is in this way, Marx reasoned, that the primitive form of society turned into a system of slaves and slave owners, which would become feudalism, which would become capitalism, which in the ultimate end, by necessity, would become the communist socialism for which Marx believed the world to be destined (Hunt 63). As Engels put it, “ice becomes water and water steam; slaves becomes serfs and serfs free men” (Berlin 105).

This idea of course implies that the great changes in history are brought about solely by economic forces and by the relations of men based on current economic conditions and not by great realizations of moral right in the areas of religion, ethics, or law. Here lies the second great idea of historical materialism: that the economic (and thus social) situation of society as brought about by the dialectic forms the basis, or “substructure” of society, upon which rests the “superstructure”, consisting of the ethics and institutions of society (Hunt, 62). The way people in a society think, their ideals, and their beliefs are, according to Marx, determined wholly by the economic system which underlies the society. When the productive forces come into conflict with the productive

relations through some new economic development, one force hinders the other, necessitating a change in society, which will of course be accompanied by changes in the society's superstructure. Marx reasoned that these changes in the substructure will no longer be necessary once a communist society, in which there is no need for conflict between classes, comes into being. Marx waited his whole life for this final revolution but he never saw his prediction realized.

With Marx's ideas of historical materialism thus laid out, the obvious question to anyone living in the world of 1990 is this—are Marx's arguments and reasonings valid? Does some sort of materialistic dialectic create conflict in the substructure of society upon which the societal superstructure is based? And, ultimately, will Marx's predictions of the eventual appearance of a harmonious, communistic society ever materialize?

First of all, the idea of the importance of an historical dialectic is nearly impossible to prove or disprove. True, society throughout history has undoubtedly seen clashes of classes. But to say that history has been progressing due to the specific laws which are inherent in the idea of the dialectic is mere speculation based on observation of the past. Marx's ideas on this point fit nicely with the changes in the past from a slave system to a feudal system to a capitalistic system, but just because Hegel's ideas gave Marx a seemingly perfect basis for his theorizing, there is no scientific evidence that the chain of revolutions will end with socialism, as Marx claimed. After all, Marx held that the first society was one of cooperation. If this was so, and if, as Marx claimed, certain members of society eventually gained power over methods of production, who is to say that this very same phenomenon will not recur once socialism takes over, if it indeed ever does?

On the other hand, it is extremely difficult to argue with Marx's assertion that the substructure of society defines the superstructure. An

excellent example is the structure of a society based on a slave labor economy. The idea of owning another man seems immoral to most people today, but when the slave system provided, for the most part, the wealth of entire nations, slavery was easily accepted with little or no second thought. This was not because the slave owners were devoid of morals, but rather because their primary concern was (as Marx would argue) their own economic well-being and survival, and this well-being was provided for them by a system which employed the use of slave labor. Whatever is necessary to maintain a society's economic survival (and the economic survival of its individuals) will be accepted, not widely criticized. The same reasoning can justify the wrongs of today's capitalism. Capitalism certainly has its drawbacks, in that it often lets certain individuals amass great fortunes while others wallow in abject poverty, but because the system as a whole is keeping most members of society in a state of economic survival, its excesses are often overlooked. The consensus in the United States certainly does not hold that capitalism is an evil institution, completely devoid of morality.

Marx would undoubtedly agree with this evaluation of capitalism, and with good reason. Capitalism is not perfect for all in the society, for it perpetuates classes which will always be in conflict until some drastic change eliminates them. But in his ultimate conclusion, that socialistic communism is the inevitable goal of world society, Marx seems to have forgotten about one of the basic precepts of his historical materialism: that all men ultimately strive for the "production of the means to support life (Hunt 61). It would seem that man, with this selfish (but not by any stretch bad) inherent quality, never could move into a state of complete cooperation. Communism has been attempted in the modern world, and if the events of the past year are any indication, it has failed. Marx would of course argue that the communism of the U.S.S.R. and other

Eastern Bloc nations was not pure socialistic communism as he saw it, and he would be right. But it appears that the failure of communism in this century, regardless of how pure the system started off, lay in the fact that those in a position of leadership in the communist societies have taken advantage of their positions, allowing for occurrences of the most basic sort of class struggle. It is unfortunate to note, but it seems that human nature does not permit all of those in a position of any sort of power (even if, in theory, the power is only political) to remain satisfied with equality. Even if Marx could have come up with a way of bringing about a communist society with no need of government, he stated that in the most primitive society, of cooperation, some individuals eventually obtained an advantage. Maybe someday Marxist communism will predominate in this world, but even if it does, it appears as though the whole vicious circle of cooperative, to slave-based, to feudal, to capitalistic society, might very well just begin all over again.

Bibliography

Berlin, Isaiah. Karl Marx. New York: Time Incorporation, 1963.

Hunt, R.N. Carew. The Theory and Practice of Communism. Middlesex, England: Peguin Books, 1971.

Rossiter, Clinton. Marxism: The View From America. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and the World, Inc., 1960.

THE INEFFECTIVENESS OF THE ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION

By Alex Marchetti

In the early years of its independence, the United States was governed by the Articles of Confederation. The Articles governed the states for nine years from 1781 to 1789. During this time the Articles proved to be very ineffective and the United States consequently suffered severe setbacks. An effective government is one that the people of the country have faith in. In addition, an effective government is one which handles foreign affairs, and does not allow other countries to infringe upon their rights and their territory. Finally, an effective government is one which establishes a favorable balance of trade, and acts fairly toward all of its members in trade policies. The Articles of Confederation lacked these key ingredients, and therefore proved to be an ineffective government.

An important element in an effective government is the faith that the citizens have in it. As the years passed, it became more and more evident that people were losing confidence in their government. As stated in a letter from Delegate Joseph Jones of Virginia to George Washington on February 27, 1783, one group of people extremely upset by the government was the army. They were angry because they were not being paid. This was a result of Congress not having the power to tax. The lack of funds created not only internal problems, but external problems as well. Congress had trouble in paying off debts to foreign countries. Along with the army, delegates felt it was time to meet and amend the Articles. When they got together, they realized how many loopholes the Articles really had. Instead of amending the Articles, they decided to

do away with the Articles altogether. This shows that not only were the common people and the army upset with their government, but so were the congressmen themselves.

Besides failing to inspire faith in the government, the Articles were also ineffective in dealing with foreign countries. Although the United States won its independence, other countries still had control of some areas which rightfully belonged to the United States. As stated in John Jay's instructions of March 7, 1785, the British still had possession of land in the United States after the war. Despite their victory, the United States did not have control over all of their posts and territories. The Articles of Confederation did not enforce any territorial laws on any foreign country. After the United States won the war, the leaders should have claimed all of the land that was rightfully theirs, so that there would be no question as to whom the land belonged. However, due to the lack of power in the Articles, this process did not take place, and the British retained control of some territories. Along with the British, the Spanish also had some control in the United States after the war. As stated in John Jay's speech on August 6, 1786 to Congress on negotiations with Spain's Minister Diego de Gardoqui, the most important area to the Spanish was the Mississippi River. The Spanish Minister insisted that the Americans give up their rights to the Mississippi. He wanted to make a life-long treaty with the United States that insured this. However, John Jay reminded him that as the population increased, more and more people would move west and take advan-

tage of the Mississippi as a highway to the sea. Jay was in favor of a treaty that would last twenty-five to thirty years. Spain did not have any respect for the United States nor their government. Spain wanted to play this political game in order to make it more difficult for the United States. Neither Britain nor Spain had any respect for the Articles of Confederation. Therefore, they were not threatened by the orders of Congress.

Perhaps the weakest part of the Articles of Confederation was the inability to control interstate and foreign commerce. This lack of power was one of the reasons why Congress had no money. As revealed in a letter from the Rhode Island Assembly to Congress on November 30, 1782, Congress was going to put a tax on imported goods. However, this was a very unpopular idea. Small states such as Rhode Island were strongly opposed to this idea because they felt that this was very hard on the most commercial states. Also, Congress was going to introduce officers into each state to make sure this act was enforced. Moreover, the states were given no indication as to time or quantity on this act. The states felt that this was an infringement on their rights. As revealed in market value and population statistics, there was a lack of prosperity under the Articles of Confederation. During the years 1784 to 1789, the population steadily increased. However, the overall increase in United States exports was minimal. Due to population increase, one would believe that there would be an increase in exports accompanying the increase in work force. However, this was not the case. Once again, such statistics reveal the ineffectiveness of the Articles. Furthermore, as stated in Jay's instructions, England shut off the West Indies to the United States as a punishment to them for winning the war. Again, this illustrates the lack of power that the Articles had over foreigners and trade.

In conclusion, the Articles of Confederation

proved to be an ineffective government for the United States from 1781 to 1789. The lack of faith by the people, and the lack of power in the areas of trade and foreign affairs brought about the end of the Articles. Not only were Americans losing confidence in the Articles, but the foreign countries had no respect for American government under the Articles. As the years passed, the leaders of the United States finally realized that changes had to be made. However, after sitting down and pondering the Articles, they finally realized that this government was not suitable for the United States. It was then decided to do away with the Articles all together. This decision paved the way for one of the most respected documents in the world, the Constitution of the United States of America.

IDEOLOGY AND POWER-POLITICS IN THE ERAS OF RELIGIOUS WAR AND COLD WAR

By Ben Sussman

The question is a simple one: to what extent are two eras, namely the Counter Reformation era (1560-1648) and the Post World War Two era (1945-), analogous? Yet the breadth of the question makes it elusive and open to a variety of interpretations. The question might best be approached with an analysis of the politics and events of the two periods. By examining each period independently, one can analyze the roles of power-struggles and ideology in each era. Thus for each era, a new question is asked: How do the forces of power-politics and ideology contribute to the conflicts of the time? It is through this question that detailed formulations can be made about the two periods of history.

In general, the conclusions drawn are as follows: Seventeenth century Europe was ravaged by religious war, primarily caused by a mix of ideology and religious nationalism. By the end of the Thirty Years' War, the system of "balance of power" had crept onto the scene, and was being employed by a number of nations. As the wars lingered on, the system was moving through continuous phases of development and acceptance. Finally, the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 firmly established this system of international relations. In the 20th century this "system" is still in effect, and had crystallized into specific mechanisms of international foreign policy. By examining certain uses of the system in current times, a number of similarities to events of the religious wars can be identified.

The analysis begins with the period 1560 to 1648. In this era of religious war, the question is posed: How did ideology or power politics influence international relations? After extensive examination of trends, the answer is clear. The religious wars were actually caused by a number of factors, the most prominent being an intertwining of religious zeal and new nationalism. As the wars persisted, the issues became more political and secular, until in 1648 the Peace of Westphalia established a modern "balance of power" system (Palmer 145).

It is first important to understand both the importance and inevitability of such a political system. In the years preceding 1560, the Papacy insured an international peace. So far there was no threat of one nation dominating all Europe. Europe was religiously homogenous, and the Pope represented a unified "moral" force. Yet gradually, European diplomacy became burdened with an internal contradiction. In practice, international relations were for the purpose of pursuing "peace for all Christianity"...but in reality, Machiavellian power politics came into play. Thus, treaties of the period were established for purposes of power struggle although they were filled with moral and peaceful rhetoric. This internal contradiction of stated purposes versus real purposes is an example of a developing secular political system in international affairs (Cooper 34).

In order to remedy this unintentional hypocrisy in diplomacy, a "balance" system was needed. The system probably would have evolved sooner had not the Reformation torn apart nations. Successful "balance" diplomacy can only be achieved in a Europe where all nations have the same goals. Religious revolution, unfortunately, spurred heterogenous ideologies and destroyed any possibility of unity or "balance". "Unless people realize that they have to live together, in spite of their differences, diplomats have no place to stand" (Mattingly, Garrett 168).

It is also important to understand the unity which existed between church and state. The sum total of Spanish nationalism centered around the Catholic church. In Germany, the princes, who had been granted power by the terms of Augsburg, represented both national and religious force. The sense of "localism" was so strong in Germany that the state and religion could not be separated. England's pride rallied around defiance of Catholicism. Gustavus Adolphus represented both the power of Sweden and the "Defender of the Protestant Cause." In each of these states, as well as others, the terms "religion" and "nation" were synonymous. Worse yet, Europe was torn by two ideologies, each of which demanded total destruction of the enemy.

There are many factors which contributed to the actual outbreak of religious wars. The two religious ideologies were mutually exclusive. Due to the melding of ideology and nationalism, the only logical outcome could be mutually exclusive nations. Additionally, the trend in rising state absolutism led to more organized armies. The seventeenth century marked an era of the permanent, professional soldier in service to the monarch, as opposed to the mercenary armies of years past (Wijn 200). The modernization of milita-

rism coincided with increased funding and standardization of equipment. The overall result was religio-nationalist war machines in service of the ever-powerful "state".

Thus, the Wars of Religion were not unexpected. It was during these wars that the nations of Europe which began as ideological zealots ended as secular strategists. This development can be seen in the war between Spain and the Low Countries. Spain began its "Catholic" crusade to subdue heretics, but Phillip also sought Habsburg political dominion. Although the Dutch were religiously harassed, Phillip's policy became an issue of political resistance, with all religions in the Netherlands uniting to drive out Spain. Even the eventual English involvement was not so much for religious reasons as it was to prevent Spanish domination. England merely sought to preserve its national security.

The wars which divided France internally are another example of a trend toward secular philosophy. The Calvinist Huguenots were primarily noblemen. Because the Calvinist creed denied subservience to any form of higher authority, the civil wars in France may be interpreted as political, a sort of feudal rebellion. Even the Edict of Nantes had secular tinges to it: the purpose was not so much to establish religious peace as it was to stamp out the embers of political upheaval. (Mousnier 487).

The Thirty Years' War, however, is the best example of the transformation to a "balance of power" system. To begin with, the war was multi-layered. On the first layer, it started as a German religious civil war. Due to the power struggle of the independent princes and generals, the civil war became constitutional and moved against the Holy Roman Emperor himself. On the first

international layer, the Dutch feared a revived conflict with Spain and therefore allied with the Protestant forces for these political reasons. On the most fundamental international level, it became a war between France and the threat of "Universalism" posed by the Hapsburgs. Richelieu was perhaps one of the earliest modern "balance of power" statesmen. He forged numerous and changing alliances for the sole purpose of countering the Hapsburgs, ignoring all matters of religion. As the war continued, its character changed. Religious issues, so prominent in the early years, declined, and power politics, never absent, finally predominated. (Beller 307).

With the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, the transformation was complete. The German religious war had long since been settled by the Treaties at Prague and Munster, and Germans strongly resented French and Spanish proxy armies fighting on Teutonic soil. The Westphalia treaties ended the advance of the Counter Reformation, but religion was not the issue anymore. The Holy Roman Empire was dissolved by granting full sovereignty to each of the German provinces, as well as the Netherlands. France continued to war with Hapsburg forces. Most importantly, the European "state system" had been started. The nations of Europe realized that differing ideologies could live together, and that individual preservation was key to balance. The only threat to peace was the destruction of the balance of power. The power of leaders was henceforth restricted each to his own state, and with the power came the responsibility of state defense through any foreign policy necessary to maintain sovereignty. Diplomacy could be re-established and a "balance" put into effect.

The era from 1945 to the present is known as the "Cold War". Once again, the question is posed:

How does ideology and the power struggle affect international politics? The answer for today's world is both simple and complex. The ideology element is simply intensified propaganda used as a "cover-up" for a firmly established "balance of power" system. On a more complex level, the "balance of power" system is sustained through intricate methods of foreign policy.

To be sure, the "balance of power" theory holds that the greatest end is a preservation of national sovereignty. The means to that end are without moral or ideological limitations. The greatest enemy is any force which may subvert a nation (Morgenthau 109). In practice, the balance of power can be sustained in one of two ways.

First, there is direct escalation between two powers. In the Cold War era, an example is the nuclear arms race. In the previous time period, an example was a direct confrontation between France and Spain at the end of the Thirty Years' War. Secondly, there is indirect escalation over a third power. This is commonly known as a "power vacuum" theory. In modern times, the United States and Soviet Union have fought for balance by being pulled into less powerful third world countries. This element of "balance of power" often entails use of "proxy" wars. Nicaragua is one illustration of this idea, as was Korea or even Vietnam, just as Germany was a battleground for the international powers in the Thirty Years' War (Morgenthau 173-175).

Another instrument of "balance of power" is the ability to make alliances (Morgenthau 181-186). In the Cold War, NATO and the Warsaw Pact are classic examples of alliances created to preserve national sovereignty. The idea is that if one nation is threatened by another power, the "balance" is restored by group protection. In the

seventeenth century, Richelieu allied with the Dutch against the Spanish Netherlands, and allied with Protestant German princes and the Swedes against Hapsburg forces. Richelieu was aware that France alone could not balance out Hapsburg power.

A third instrument of "balance of power" is the policy of prestige (Morgenthau 72-78). By impressing nations or maintaining an image, effective power can be psychologically emitted. Although debatable, U.S. involvement in Vietnam was closely related to prestige and national credibility. And, as in Spain's case, its leaders found it difficult to back down from conflict in the Netherlands and in Germany, despite heavy economic and military losses.

The role of ideology in modern politics has become well defined. Namely, ideology is used as a smokescreen to justify "balance of power" policies. The ideologies of capitalism and communism are mutually exclusive, just as the differing religions were in the seventeenth century. Propaganda, however, has become essential to effective stability in today's world. Americans are taught to associate communism with totalitarianism. Russians are taught to believe capitalists are "imperialist war pigs." However, it is through this ideological propaganda that the superpower governments justify mutual containment (Morgenthau 250).

Unfortunately, it is difficult to find a phenomenon similar to propaganda in the seventeenth century. At the time of the religious wars, ideology did fall into the background and served as a justification for power politics. However, in all likelihood there was no conscious or intentional effort to deceive the public. It is probable that the leaders themselves embraced the religious cause

as a psychological rationalization for their power struggles.

Thus the two eras have been analyzed, and separate conclusions drawn. In the time of 1560-1648, there was an emerging system of power politics among states amidst many religious-nationalist wars. In the modern era after 1945, it is easy to identify a fully formed "balance" diplomacy system which makes active use of ideology as a justification.

It must be noted that it is difficult to make comparisons between the two periods. Because one era demonstrates a still-developing state system while another demonstrates a fully-formed one, it is especially tricky not to contrive similarities. Often an example of modern diplomacy can only be matched with a half-similar example in earlier history. Because historians have the power of retrospective vision, however, modern examples can often serve as models to demonstrate the stage of political development in an earlier time period.

"The Wars of Religion have shown that the attempt to impose one's own religion as the only true one upon the rest of the world is as futile as it is costly," says Hans Morgenthau, a professor of political science.

A century of almost unprecedented bloodshed, devastation, and barbarization was needed to convince the contestants that the two religions could live together in mutual toleration. The two political religions of our time have taken the place of the two great Christian denominations...Will the political religions of our time need the lesson of the Thirty Years' War,

or will they rid themselves in time of the universalistic aspirations that inevitable issue in inconclusive war?" (Morgenthau 241).

Professor Morgenthau's question is a profound one which captures the essence of the questions tackled in this analysis. If our modern era insists on examining political struggles in years gone by, perhaps we can learn not to duplicate the mistakes.

Bibliography

Beller, E.A., "Thirty Years War" The New Cambridge Modern History Vol. IV. University Press 1970.

Cooper, J.P., "General Introduction" The New Cambridge Modern History Vol. IV. University Press 1970.

Cooper, J.P., "Sea-Power" The New Cambridge Modern History Vol. IV. University Press 1970.

Mattingly, Garrett. Renaissance Diplomacy. Penguin 1985.

Morgenthau, Hans J. Politics Among Nations Knopf 1967.

Mosse, G.L., "Changes in Religious Thought" The New Cambridge Modern History Vol. IV. University Press 1970.

Mousnier, R., "The Exponents and Critics of Absolutism" The New Cambridge Modern History . Vol. IV. University Press 1970.

Spooner, F.C., "The European Economy" The New Cambridge Modern History Vol. IV

University Press 1970.

Palmer, R.R. and Colton, Joel. A History of the Modern World Sixth Edition, Alfred A. Knopf Inc. 1983.

Wijn, J.W. "Military Forces and Warfare" The New Cambridge Modern History Vol. IV. University Press 1970.

THE GOLDEN SHELL

By Brian Hammersley

The American Heritage Dictionary defines the term gild in two ways, the first as "to give an often deceptively attractive or improved appearance to", and the second definition as "to cover with or as if with a thin layer of gold." The Gilded Age in American history closely parallels this definition, a prosperous period for some who gained their "gilt" by not so righteous means. The "Captains of Industry", as they were called, built lavish houses that were very ornately decorated. Beyond that, the appearances of the houses revealed evidence of the elite class's real values. On the outside they were figuratively covered with gold, but these people were actually "robber barons" at heart with cold ruthlessness at their inner core.

The houses of the "captains of industry" were grand in appearance from any angle and always one of the first, if not the only house, one noticed when passing. There were many specific characteristics that distinguished these houses, but there were four exterior features that each of the houses had in common (Wheeler and Becker 55-63). Their sizes varied from large to gigantic, but they all had at least two floors. Unlike the newly designed skyscrapers whose main purpose was to utilize the given space to its greatest potential, these houses were built solely to be large and impressive, and most times there were not many people in the family. There was liberal use of gingerbread to decorate the houses, along with other ornate patterns and designs. The various bulbs, columns, and imposing moldings on these houses gave them a unique appearance. These dwellings were not only large, but each house seemed to be trying to appear more ostentatious than its neighbor. All of these houses had porches and/or verandas and some even had more than

one. Some verandas were huge structures that wrapped around large portions of the house. All of these houses had also at least two high points on them, usually one being a chimney and the other a peaked roof. Balconies were also incorporated into the designs of some of these houses, as in figure five. All of these dwellings had these features for a reason: there was a value portrayed by each that meant a great deal to the people who lived in them.

The prestigious figures who lived in these dwellings conveyed their values through their houses. The size demonstrated a need to flaunt their wealth. By erecting a huge structure in their name, owners made obvious to other people their high social stature. This satisfied a need to impress the lower, middle, and upper class citizens. The decoration was used as a further example of their affluence. Anyone walking down that street would notice that particular house and its adornments. The house that towered over the rest of the homes in the neighborhood became an advertisement of the opulence of the people who lived inside. This was also the case with the large porches and verandas. The purpose of these additions was wholly to expose the social interactions of the wealthy owners for all to see. It was important for the lower-class to be able to view the finer life, and also for the wealthy to see who their next door neighbors were entertaining. This outdoor display could be related to a high society fashion show. The guests and the entertainers all wore the latest fashions in clothes and hair style, even for the most mundane gathering. The high peaks and balconies epitomized the frame of mind of the wealthy during the Gilded Age. They felt as if they were above the rest of the working world. Their peaks towered above the common,

and their balconies raised them above the working class - literally and figuratively. What better way was there tangibly to display one's prosperity?

The floor plans of these homes were "blueprints of dreams" that revealed the haughty thinking of the "robber barons". All the rooms were very spacious. The dimensions shown on the floor plans would lead to the impression that the families living in them would be large, but that was not always true. At times, it would be a small family that lived in a very large house. All of these houses incorporated a great hall with a grand staircase at or near the front door. The stairwells usually were huge winding steps that drew attention to anyone going up or down. Ornate handrails would be another method of drawing attention to those traveling on the stairs. How common rooms were described also indicates a pretentious attitude. The bedroom in some houses was called a chamber, and the living room was called the parlor. The subtle differences in names indicated another way of emphasizing their social class and need to separate themselves from others.

The floor plans themselves illustrated the elite class's values. All the rooms that guests would visit were large. There seemed to be a constant competition among the wealthy to see who could build the largest and most extravagant building. In actuality, then, the rooms were large to satisfy the owner's ego, and not really a space requirement for the size of their family. The great stairways that were constructed showed that the inhabitants of the house always wanted to be the center of attention. Making grand entrances and exits made a person feel more important, and the esteem of the public was very high on the elite class's list of values. Also, the stairway looked like one in a castle, and one could deduce that the wealthy felt much like royalty in their social position. The verandas were a perfect way to display who they were entertaining, but also

served as a barrier to people. They wanted privacy, and the verandas and porches made it difficult for passersby to look in, but the owners could easily see out. This physical barrier reflected the social barrier that existed between the affluent "robber barons" and the general public.

The parlor was an important room on the floor plan. The definition of a parlor is "a room in a private home set apart for the entertainment of visitors." This room would be decorated lavishly in an attempt to impress their wealthy guests. No expense was spared on the wall coverings, furniture, lighting, and other garish decoration. The chamber was the robber baron's private quarters and was an extremely socially significant room. Both of these nouns (parlor and chamber) had roots from French words, which is not surprising. Overseas travel had become much easier, and ideas from Europe could be imported to America. The wealthy class that visited Europe was enamored by their decor and apparently used the words to describe certain rooms. One could deduce that it gave the rooms a greater feeling of importance to those who visited them. It also sounds more spectacular to go "to the parlor to entertain" than to show your guests "to the living room" so they can make themselves comfortable. All the rooms were decorated extensively, arguably to ridiculous lengths.

The interior features were much like the exterior characteristics-extravagant, and, in most cases, unnecessary. All of these domiciles had at least two fireplaces, while common houses had at most one if they could afford it. The decor was very ornate, with garish mouldings and wall coverings. There were interior columns, chandeliers, and brightly painted rooms. The many pieces of furniture looked as though they had been imported from a French castle. There were mirrors and paintings of royalty in most of the rooms as well.

There was a great deal of furniture in most of the rooms. It gave some of the rooms a cluttered look, and almost defeated the room's purpose. These people were so obsessed with trying to impress others with their wealth that they almost ruined the function of a room in the process.

Regarding the values that can be gleaned from the decoration of these homes, much is obvious. The fireplace did not serve as an essential heating unit, as it was to most people, but, as a place for relaxing or socializing. The castle-like decor in these houses shows the large egos that these people possessed. They put themselves on the level of past kings, rulers of nations. They felt that with their financial positions they were the rulers of America and should live in that manner.

The sole motivation of the elite during the Gilded Age was to enhance their way of life and to benefit their person. It was their intention to live by Benjamin Franklin's aphorism, "time is money." The only way, in their view, to gain power was through the possession of abundant funds. How this money was acquired, fair or foul, did not matter. These men manipulated the government, more specifically the Congress, into passing bills that would do little or no harm to them. Their main goal was to continue to gain profit, and at their political and fiscal level, they were able to mold the purposes of government to fit their needs. They always attempted to keep business running smoothly and profitably. The robber barons were very harsh in their treatment of the common people who worked for them, and had no remorse when it came to firing people or brutally crushing strikes. Consequently, they were not well-loved by the people that they employed and there was much resentment towards them. As the robber barons became wealthier, the rest of society became poorer, and there seemed to no way to stop this trend. These gold-covered homes were nothing more than an extension of their personalities and satisfied an obsessive desire to be better than the rest. Inside, the

houses were cold-not from lack of heat, but from lack of compassion.

Bibliography

Wheeler, William Bruce and Susan D. Becker. Discovering the American Past, Vol. II (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1986), 55-63.

MALADIES OF THE MODERATES

By Andrea Gregor

"We are here in a land fabulous but real, where the wisdom and common sense of the moderate are not wisdom and common sense, but folly" (Brinton 147). Crane Brinton describes the lofty intentions of the moderates during the French Revolution and exaggerates their feeble and unexpected results. The moderates from 1789-1792 were intrinsically vulnerable with countless weaknesses in their coalition and policies. They failed to retain control of the French government and complete most of their projects because the leadership of the moderates was only the first tentative stage of the Revolution. Divided within, and yet unable to please the interests of extremists both to the right and left, moderates executed contradictory, untimely, or inconsistent legislation. Though extremists occupied a minority position within the French Revolution, their vehemence and tight network of support ended the reign of the very flawed moderates.

It is true that the initial step in any series of changes is dissatisfaction. However, mere dissatisfaction is futile in bringing about change unless it leads to a careful assessment of the problem and thoughtful propositions for reform. This was the inevitable problem of the French moderates, inevitable because they were the party of the initial reaction of dissatisfaction. The problems of the stagnant bourgeoisie, the disgraceful standard of living for the peasants and working class, and the domination of government by the first two estates were all obvious problems of the Old Regime. Moderates knew that they were dissatisfied but knew not what to do. Therefore, their actions had broad aims and were indecisive, reflecting the whole of the moderate party. The goal of the National Assembly, af-

firmed by the Oath of the Tennis Court, was simply to create a new constitution (Gottschalk 128). What that constitution would include, they did not know. In addition, the group had not even agreed on how such a measure should be voted (Gottschalk 119). Clearly, the objectives were neither thought out nor stated and instead of proceeding to the task of creating a constitution, the moderates had to resolve the primary conflict of the number of chambers, veto power, and voting. Beyond this there was yet another problem with the National Assembly's agenda. They had been chiefly interested in the financial dilemmas which were indeed the primary reason for their initial dissatisfaction, but were merely willing to grant a few much needed reforms as an aside (Gottschalk 78). The link between financial and social issues was not understood in their early legislation and the Assembly members proceeded as if they could address finances alone until they realized how unworkable that approach was. Such inconsistencies in this early stage of the revolution were confusing to many rural people who received delayed and unreliable communication from Paris (Gottschalk 138). Many of the first and minor rural insurrections resulted. In all of these ways, the moderates were truly unfortunate because the nature of any initial reaction is haphazard, unfocused, and flawed for lack of a pre-existing model of revolution.

The moderates assembled as a large, dissatisfied group, bonded only by an oath to draw up a new constitution. Their formation as a government and political party was hasty and expedient. It is logical that out of this group emerged opposing interests and the need to appease or satisfy them. Soon after the formation of the National Assem-

bly, moderates realized that there was less homogeneity than diversity among them (Brinton 156). This was first apparent in the controversy over how many bodies should exist in the Constituent Assembly and what role the King should play. Right wing, conservative loyalists became an obvious group and left wing, republican representatives another. The left wing was made up of third estate representatives who supported a unitary government. Having acknowledged sharp differences in their goals and methods for achieving them, the moderates refused to dictate their own solutions, at least at that moment in time. "If voting by head is necessary when it involves the mere sacrifice of part of our property, it must be much more important when it is a question of liberty, the honor and the lives of citizens...not vicious distinction of the orders" (Dawson 21).

Moderates, as their name suggests, did not represent any truly extremist groups. It is true that there began to be a definite polarization within the Constituent Assembly, but the Assembly as a whole remained moderate for two reasons. First, the mere act of beginning a revolution was radical in itself, and beyond that, the government did not venture too much further. The assumption was that these groups were taking great measures just by taking the Tennis Court Oath and struggling over the new format for the Assembly (Brinton 138). This only froze progress and prompted even the confused King to say that if the three estates would refuse to cooperate with him, then he would carry out his own program (Gottschalk 128). This was a very opportune moment for extremist factions to point out how little the new government was accomplishing. Had not both the right and the left of the Constituent Assembly been trying to benefit nobles and workers respectively, there may have been more aggressive and truly helpful legislation. Such circumstances helped to inspire the extremist movements.

There were inherent weaknesses in the moder-

ates' control of the government due to the growing demands of minority extremist groups. As the legally constituted government, moderates in power were forced to shoulder the responsibility for all the people, not doing anything that would blatantly favor any single social group (Brinton 136). It needed to operate under the premise of equality put forth in the constitution while continuing to use conventions of government. Each act was under the scrutiny of all special interest groups looking for ways in which it either stepped out of bounds or did not live up to its institutional role. "If they gave bread to the poor, the Jacobins cried out they were attempting bribery. If they did nothing, the Jacobins complained that they lacked social conscience" (Brinton 139). When finally something decisive was done, the many groups considered to be represented by this established legal government could only be dissatisfied.

Again, it is unfortunate that the moderates were the first to attempt change after the Old Regime from the position of a conventional government. The examples of the policies of the moderates, such as the assumption of the constitution, their actions towards the Church, and lack of actions for the peasant and working class were all inadequate and met with severe criticism, criticism that paved the way for extremist parties.

It was a mistake for the moderates to make lofty claims in their constitution that they were incapable of putting into effect. The constitution acknowledged each person's "natural rights of liberty, property, security, and resistance to oppression", and continued to say that these rights should be protected (Dawson 43). Too many words and too few actions arguably encouraged future violence in many ways and at the very least it caused many to call these rights to attention in writing. The third estate felt that they had a right to demand "elimination of all useless expenditures in all parts of the administration, after which they will consent to all these for the

dignity of the throne" (Dawson 27).

The Assembly's behavior toward the Church was a simple act of making more enemies than it could afford. Before the Civil Constitution of the Clergy was declared, more than half the clergy had joined the National Assembly (Gottschalk 129). The King was still in a position where he could conceivably meet the demands of the Assembly more easily and many workers and peasants had not yet been swayed to any one cause. The Civil Constitution of the Clergy was a drastic measure in relation to moderate policies and succeeded in demonstrating the handicapped means which the Assembly used to create legislation. Confiscating Church lands and bringing the Church under the state alienated the Church from the moderate regime. Rural people who were loyal to clergy that happened to be conservative, or refractory, were also alienated by the Constitutional Assembly. Those who saw it strategically necessary for the Church to be unified were disgusted: "In all times, but particularly in this we must be unibus labii, and our conduct must be the same; this unity ought to produce the fortunate effect we intend" (Dawson 74). The King was for once and for all completely turned against the actions of the Assembly, leaving no chance for any help from him. Finally, the practical results of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy were not overwhelmingly positive in the least. Sale of Church lands was not aimed at those who really needed it and most clerical land was sold in northern France with variable impact (Hunt 147). Due to the weaknesses inherent in the Constituent Assembly, it is not surprising that the moderates failed to produce an effective piece of legislation.

Finally, the needs of great masses of people were not alleviated. The aforementioned incidental social reforms were not even carried through, and in the face of inflation, scarcity, bad harvests and unemployment due to political tentativeness, extremist groups found support among work-

ers and peasants (Gottschalk 147). It was not strategic for the moderates to address the bourgeoisie over the masses, which is what their short-reaching policies did. Of the lofty claims of rights and needs of their people, most of it was little more than propaganda prohibiting past wrongs but offering no foundations for present rights (Gottschalk 140). Especially as other nations came in and warfare began, which was not altogether unwanted, rural people often took the brunt of the violence. It is not surprising that being ignored and beaten upon led to violence towards the moderates. The moderate regime was like a curious animal, rushing in an unknown territory only to be pinned to the ground, belly-up, unable to successfully get back on its feet again. In this vulnerable position, the moderates could be overwhelmed by extremist group, unified by strong ideologies, vehement to the point of fanaticism, disciplined and centralized in authority (Brinton 149). Their voices were clear, not jumbled or contradictory. They were able to act with deliberateness because they had learned from the mistakes of the moderates. Extremist groups were never thought accountable to institutions or conventions since their existence was illegal to begin with (Brinton 139). Onto the scene they were able to come and attack the many weaknesses of the moderates, whether they were weaknesses of theory or practice. Once violence began, the constant cycle of dissatisfaction, change, and reassessment continued.

Bibliography

Brinton, Crane. Anatomy of a Revolution. New York: Vintage Books, 1965.

Church, William F., Ed. The Influence of Enlightenment on the French Revolution. Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Co., 1974.

Gottschalk, Louis R. The Era of the French Revolution. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1929.

Hunt, Lynn. Politics, Culture, and Class in the French Revolution. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.

THE EVER CHALLENGED BISMARCK

By Gregory A. Kroll

On January 18, 1871, in the Hall of Mirrors in Versailles, the German Empire was proclaimed. This was the point from which a new era of foreign policy was to begin. Bismarck, as German chancellor, continued to follow only the interests of the state, basing his foreign policy upon real factors in European relations. At this point, Germany was militarily dominant with a chancellor who intended to keep it that way. Bismarck did not intend to use this power for aggressive purposes though. He was more concerned with keeping peace in Europe and needed to assure the other European powers of his intent. Bismarck had the opinion that Germany had everything it needed, including land, and that war did not offer any actual gain (Brandenburg 87). The preservation of peace was the most certain and least costly means of safeguarding the state he created (Rich 181). From 1871 to 1890, Bismarck's foreign policy consisted of three main objectives. The first was to isolate France as much as possible so as to make a war of revenge out of the question. The second was to prevent an Austro-Russian war by inducing both Russia and Austria to come to a settlement in the Near East. The third was to prevent a Franco-Russian alliance which would eventually lead to a two-front war.

Basically, the object of Bismarck's foreign policy was to reduce the pressure upon the German frontiers as much as possible by diverting European powers to colonial fields and by building a system of protective agreements that made action difficult and dangerous (Rich 106). Bismarck's first move to stabilize the European state system established in 1871 was an attempt to revive the Metternichian Concert among the conservative powers of Europe. He looked upon

Russia and Austria as natural allies in working toward this goal. With the threat of revolution in both of these nations, they would join with Bismarck in a policy aimed at preserving the international as well as the domestic status quo for a war, with all its risks, would only assist the revolutionaries (Rich 181). Thus, in the course of 1873, several treaties between these three powers resulted in the formation of the first Three Emperors' League (joined by Italy in September 1873). It would only work as long as the interests of the conservative powers were in harmony (Rich 181).

With the Three Emperors' League, Bismarck was able to isolate France temporarily. There was a lot of anti-German sentiment in France, mainly because of the loss of Alsace and Lorraine to Germany. Thus, with the French looking for a war of revenge, Bismarck had to seek alliances with the other European powers. With such violent feeling toward Germany, he decided to sanction French colonial activities and attempt to keep friendly relations with France. Bismarck hoped that if he could help this nation acquire an overseas colonial empire, then maybe the French love of prestige would be satisfied and the loss of Alsace and Lorraine would be compensated for (Brandenburg 91). When France conquered Annam and Tonkin, Bismarck gave his consent and drew attention towards Morocco as a potential French colony. He also encouraged French occupation of Tunis (Brandenburg 91). France had much invested in this territory. When Italian interests closed in on Tunis, France immediately took it over and drove Italy into joining with Germany and Austria to form the Triple Alliance of 1881 (Rich 191). This alliance was a general agreement to support the monarchical principle

and the existing political and social order. It also assured Germany of Italian neutrality in the event of a Franco-German War (Rich 191). As time passed, General Boulanger rose and the French diplomat Ferry fell from power. With French defeats in Indochina and patriotic societies crying out for the return of Alsace and Lorraine, great anti-German sentiment arose once more. Ferry's cooperation with Bismarck was now considered treasonous (Rich 196). Bismarck had to establish once again, new alliances with other European powers. Soon, a more intricate system of alliances was arranged, including a renewal of the Triple Alliance.

Before the end of Franco-German cooperation in colonial matters, Bismarck was able to take advantage of another colonial situation. In 1869, the Suez Canal was opened, making Egypt an area of prime strategic importance. Shortly after, France and Britain took joint control of the Egyptian government, which was highly in debt. In January 1882, a group of Egyptian army officers overthrew European control and established a national government. Britain responded with force and regained control for itself. With British occupation of Egypt, Italy and France grew angry because they, too, had strategic as well as economic interests in the area (Rich 193). The growing hostility between these nations led Bismarck to discourage war (Rich 193). He used Britain's awkward position to offer an ultimatum.

for continued German diplomatic support now and in the future, Britain should cede to Germany the island of Helgoland (strategic base in the North Sea) and agree to further German acquisition of a few other overseas territories. Bismarck was against colonial expansion because he felt it would not benefit the state, but the acquisitions would nevertheless improve his popularity with the growing number of imperialists in his country (Rich 194). With the cooperation from Britain, Bismarck was able to maintain

peace internationally as well as domestically.

Continuing on territorial affairs, the Balkan peninsula became a subject of dispute between Austria and Russia. One of Bismarck's main points in his diplomacy was the prevention of an Austro-Russian war. Such a war would offer few gains and many losses for Germany. Therefore, he made it clear that Austria and Russia should conclude a peaceful partition of the Balkans as soon as possible, and if they went to war, Germany would intervene to prevent either power from gaining a decisive victory. Soon in 1887, a situation arose in which Russia and Turkey went to war. With Turkish defeat came the Treaty of San Stefano, and in turn European dismay (Rich 194). In June, the Congress of Berlin met to make revision in the treaty (the most important ones being made beforehand) (Rich 183). During the negotiations, Bismarck played the "honest broker" and set the pace (Rich 184). Bismarck recognized Russia's historic rights in the Balkans and influence in Bulgaria. He therefore undertook to support Russia in reestablishing a regular and legal government in Bulgaria (Albertini 97). The Congress of Berlin was successful for only a short while, because in September 1885, a revolution broke out in Bulgaria. One of its objectives was to unite Bulgaria with East Rumelia—a violation of the Berlin treaty. Europe was on the brink of war again (Rich 190). Only a complicated system of treaties, formed by Bismarck, would keep the peace.

With war threatening Europe again and a lapse in the Three Emperor's League, Bismarck thought it appropriate to set up some new alliances. On February 12, 1887, in a secret meeting with Britain and Italy, all three powers undertook to uphold the status quo in the Mediterranean, Adriatic, Aegean and Black Seas. Italy would accept Britain's position in Egypt, and Britain would support Italy in the event of "encroachments" on North Africa by another power, namely France (Seton-Watson 93).

Eight days later, the Triple Alliance was renewed, assisting both Austria and Italy (Rich 197). By December 12, a second Mediterranean Agreement had been signed between Austria, Britain, Italy and Germany. The agreement called for a maintenance of peace, status quo, local autonomies, and the freedom of the Straits of Constantinople. In one respect, this treaty was successful in that it restrained Russia from invading Bulgaria and pressuring Turkey (Albertini 100). By the end of 1887, no power could move without involving itself in endless difficulties and dangers (Rich 104).

The last point in Bismarck's foreign policy was the prevention of a Franco-Russian Alliance. Both France and Russia were feeling anti-German for much of the time between 1871-1890. Growing threats up to 1879 led to the formation of a defensive Austro-German Alliance which supported both powers from Russian aggression (Rich 187). After the Congress of Berlin, Russia became hostile once again because Germany allowed them to suffer a diplomatic setback. Bismarck tried to counter anti-German feeling by helping Russia with establishing a Bulgarian government. At this stage, Bismarck addressed himself directly to British Minister Salisbury, discussing German defense and policy. Both agreed that France and Russia were the two unstable powers in Europe (Seton-Watson 94). Towards the end of the 1880's, when France and Russia began to draw together, Bismarck again proposed in London an alliance with England, sanctioned by Parliament, for a mutual defense against an attack by France. Bismarck stressed that the knowledge of such a treaty would help it prevent war (Brandenburg 91). In continuing to appease Russia, Germany signed the Reinsurance Treaty on June 18, 1887. It stood for German approval of a Russian take-over of the Straits of Constantinople. By attempting to keep on good terms with Russia and establishing defensive alliances, Bismarck was able to successfully prevent a Franco-Russian alliance, and thereby

prevent a two-front war.

In 1890 came the dismissal of Otto von Bismarck as Chancellor of Germany, and the end of a great period in diplomatic history. Bismarck's shrewd tactics and realistic beliefs made him the only man at that time who could keep peace in a hostile Europe. Once he left, the alliance structures dissolved soon after and World War I later followed. Maybe if Bismarck was there, he could have prevented it. In fact, Bismarck was keeping a world war from occurring during the period from 1871-1890.

Bibliography

Albertini, Luigi. "Juggling on Horseback with Five Balls" in Hamerow, Theodore S., Editor. Otto Von Bismarck: A Historical Assessment. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath & Co., 1972.

Brandenburg, Eric. "Pax Teutonica" in Hamerow, Theodore S., Editor. Otto Von Bismarck: A Historical Assessment. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath & Co., 1972.

Rich, Norman. The Age of Nationalism and Reform, 1850-1890. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1970.

Seaton-Watson, R. W. "A Trois in a World Government by Five" in Hamerow, Theodore S., Editor. Otto von Bismarck: A Historical Assessment. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath & Co., 1972.

JOHN SWANICK'S WINNING FORMULA

By Shannon M. Schaab

Finding out who won the Philadelphia congressional election of 1794 can be achieved by a quick tally of the votes. The deeper question, which is not so easily resolved, is why the given candidate won. By counting the votes cast in this election it can be concluded that John Swanick defeated Thomas Fitzsimmons by approximately 234 votes (Becker/Wheeler Vol. 2 65). To completely evaluate the election it is necessary to discover what motivated the voters to vote as they did. Swanick won the 1794 congressional election because of demographic variability, opinions which he and his party held on important issues, and his personal background.

Demographic variables played a large part in this election. The most straightforward dividing factor was religion. It is a fact that most voters in Philadelphia were either Lutheran or Quaker, but Protestant in either case. Fitzsimmons was a Catholic and Swanick was a Protestant. Out of the six wards listed in a sample from the 1794 Philadelphia city directory, with clergy listed in each, four of the wards were shown by the election voting patterns to have been won by Swanick (Becker/Wheeler 62). The assumption can be made that the vast majority of these clergy were Protestant in keeping with the mostly Protestant community. This would suggest that religion influenced the voting habits of these districts. Further study of these two charts reveals that another group can be identified residing in areas which supported John Swanick. This group was composed of artisans and laborers. Why the people of these two occupations voted for Swanick cannot, however, be determined from this information alone.

The reason for this support can be found by

knowing the opinion of the candidates on important issues and their political affiliations. The most telling clue about this influence comes from the following statement:

...the Democratic Society, a political pressure group...to get artisans and laborers involved in protest against the policies of the Washington administration...endorsed Swanick in 1794 and worked actively on his behalf (Becker/Wheeler 59).

It can be deduced that his affiliation with the Democratic Society swayed the laborers' and artisans' votes toward Swanick.

The second significant issue in 1794 was the Whiskey Rebellion. Though neither candidate spoke specifically about this issue, the fact that Swanick was a Democratic-Republican and that Fitzsimmons was a Federalist gave the voters a general idea of their views. Biographical information on Fitzsimmons states, "He was a firm supporter of Alexander Hamilton's policies, including the excise tax" (Becker/Wheeler 56). And Hamilton's statement to President Washington on August 1, 1794 about the rebellion clearly indicates Fitzsimmons' pro-tax opinion and approval of the strict punishment of the rebels (Synet 58). On the other hand, biographical information on Swanick says, "He opposed the excise tax..." (Becker/Wheeler 57-58). This by itself does not help in understanding Philadelphia voters. But coupled with occupational and voting ward statistics, this issue becomes key to the election outcome. In interpreting the election voting patterns and the figures from the 1794 city directory, an interesting discovery can be made.

Three wards with the most inn and tavern keepers voted in favor of Swanick. It is only logical that the inn and tavern keepers who serve a lot of whiskey opposed this tax.

The final factor in this election was the candidates' background. Previously mentioned were the aspects of religion and political tendencies. The last factor which should be included is the Yellow Fever outbreak of 1793. Swanick was not politically active during the outbreak but because Fitzsimmons was in office at that time it had a permanent effect on his reputation. The election voting patterns and the figures from the 1794 city directory show that four of the seven wards in which Fitzsimmons lost had more than one hundred deaths from the fever. Regardless of whether he had any control over the sanitation funding which could have prevented the yellow fever, the people blamed him and remembered it at election time. It is also possible that had the fever not broken out the upper class lawyers, gentlemen and brokers would not have moved from the area and may have supported Fitzsimmons.

Though it is impossible to completely understand all the voters' motivations, some general trends can be found. In the Philadelphia 1794 congressional election, as with most elections, the patterns included demographic variability, general issues and political affiliations, and the candidates' personal backgrounds. Because of the multitude of facts historians have gathered, it is possible to understand the trends in an election which happened almost two hundred years ago. Is it then possible that two hundred years from now historians will be making sense of elections which have occurred lately?

Bibliography

Susan D. Becker and William Bruce Wheeler, Discovering the American Past: A Look at the Evidence, 2 vols. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin

Company, 1986) vol. 2, 65.

Harold C. Synett, ed., The Papers of Alexander Hamilton, vol. XVII (New York: Columbia University Press, 1972) 15-19 in Becker and Wheeler.

THE SPIDER AND HIS WEB: BISMARCK'S POST-UNIFICATION FOREIGN POLICY

By Bridget Laffler

"We Germans" proclaimed Otto von Bismarck in 1987 "fear God and nothing else in the world" (Seton-Watson 58). Perhaps, on that day in the Reichstag, Bismarck's bold words were true. But that day could only arrive after sixteen years of a policy of peace based on fear: fear of an Austro-Russian war and the even more potent fear yet of a Franco-Russian alliance. Bismarck allayed those fears until his forced resignation in 1890 (Colliers, 1980 ed.). In the following years his delicate system would disintegrate, the strain of a changing world finally breaking the intricate web of alliances and treaties Bismarck had spun. By so ably maintaining the status quo, he never resolved the root conflicts that necessitated such a brilliant statesman in the first place. No one could fill Bismarck's place, and by 1914 his whole structure - indeed, all of Europe - had fallen into the first "war to end all wars".

Germany's greatest threat came from its geopolitical position. Poised between a potentially hostile France and Russia, it could all too easily be dragged into a war on two fronts that would destroy the fledgling nation. Bismarck concluded that his best hope of preventing this lay in an alliance with Russia rather than with France, still smarting from the 1871 Treaty of Frankfurt (Brandenburg 53). In 1873 he resurrected the Holy Alliance with the Three Emperors League, or Dreikaiserbund, which Yale professor Paul Kennedy described as "a quasi-alliance which stressed the ideological solidarity of the Eastern monarchies, as against 'republican' France" (Kennedy 189). By 1887, Russo-Austrian relations had deteriorated to the point that the Dreikaiserbund could not be renewed. Bismarck and Shuvalov, after a very tricky set of maneu-

verings, hammered out what would be called the Reinsurance Treaty. The two powers thus agreed that if either were at war with a third great power, the other would adopt a position of "benevolent neutrality". Further, they reaffirmed their stance that the straits of Central Asia should remain closed, and they confirmed Germany's recognition of Russia's Balkan claims (Kennan 318).

Always one to cover his back, Bismarck also took steps to insure German victory should a Franco-Russian alliance solidify and turn hostile. The Triplice, or Triple Alliance between Italy, Austria-Hungary, and Germany was concluded in 1881 (Kennan 249). This alliance discouraged the two remaining powers from any inflammatory action because to be "a trois in a world governed by five" was always the stronger position (Seton-Watson 55). In the Mediterranean, Bismarck enthusiastically supported the 1887 Austrian-British-Italian agreements to maintain peace in the Near East, which, according to Luigi Albertini, "aimed at restraining Russia" (Albertini 60). The Mediterranean Agreement once again left Russia and France isolated.

The Triple Alliance also served to pull Austria-Hungary closer into Germany's sphere. A war between the Dual Monarchy and the Tsar would seriously imperil Germany. Bismarck wanted to avoid this by keeping both sides allied, if only by mutual alliances with Germany. To this end, he signed the secret Austro-German alliance of 1880 (Kennedy 190). He even tried to divide the Balkans into separate Russian and Austrian spheres of influence, a policy which ultimately proved unworkable (Langer 62).

All of these alliances, treaties, and agreements made such a web of promises and threats that no nation could successfully embark upon an aggressive or expansionistic policy. It was a masterful way to protect the status quo, but it was dependent on the man in the middle. Bismarck could maintain peace by diplomatic manipulation, but his was an isolated genius. He did little to relieve the underlying stresses that made such a complex system necessary.

Bismarck failed to make concessions to the growing imperialist, expansionist spirit in Europe. His relationship with Russia could not bear the strain of Russia's ambition in the Balkans. The question of Bulgaria finally became the proverbial straw that broke the camel's back. Bismarck refused to mediate the conflict over whether Bulgaria should be dominated by Austria or Russia - not having to choose between the two was a cornerstone of his policy. In 1887, Bulgaria dared to take independent action, and Prince Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha was crowned king. Russia viewed him as a tool of the Bulgarian Regency, which she had never recognized, leaving her with "new grounds of suspicion of the Austrians and Germans...(energizing) the nationalistic faction...against closer Russo-German relation" (Kennan 403). In 1889, Russia left Germany's sphere and improved relations with France, the other great power with a major grievance towards Germany.

France had never forgiven Germany for the indignities of the 1871 Treaty of Frankfurt. Erich Brandenburg describes her aggression towards Germany as stemming from "not only the loss of territory, but also in the supersession of her dominating position in Europe...The emergence of a new military Germany, economically superior, betokened the end of French hegemony...Alsace Lorraine was the outward and visible symbol of the overthrow France had suffered" (Brandenburg 53). By isolating France diplomatically, Bismarck did little to improve her attitude towards Germany, although he was

careful not to provoke her any further. This hostility was a threat to peace that Bismarck never solved, only buried.

Britain, for the most part, stayed aloof from Bismarck's continental maneuverings. But in the increasingly global system, she could not remain unaffected. Germany was beginning to threaten her as an industrial and economic power with its "explosive economic growth" (Kennedy 211).

The Germans themselves were aware of their new economic and political clout. Bismarck's efforts at keeping her out of colonial entanglements proved fruitless in the face of German nationalism. Kaiser Wilhelm II himself declared that Germany had "great tasks to accomplish outside the narrow boundaries of old Europe" (Kennedy). Bismarck, who manipulated a whole continent into doing his will, could not maintain his position as Chancellor in the face of growing German national spirit. On March 18, 1890 he was forced to resign. The German government was now in the hands of an expansionist Kaiser with no place to expand to without stepping on another nation's claims.

When Bismarck stepped down in 1890, he had proven himself one of the most able statesmen the world had ever seen. By discouraging a Franco-Russian alliance and placating Austro-Russian affairs, he established a peace that would last until the First World War broke out in 1914. But the seeds of that war were laid by Bismarck's conservative policy that only maintained the status quo, not altering it enough to really resolve any of the root conflicts in Europe. Even by the end of Bismarck's rule, the outlines of the sides in WWI were becoming apparent. For all his brilliance, he could not keep the ambitions of his own nation in check nor could he halt the growing animosity towards Germany felt by Britain, France, and Russia. Regardless of his brave words to the Reichstag, Bismarck and Germany had to fear powers much more immediate than

the divine.

Bibliography

Collier's Encyclopedia, 1980 edition, "Otto von Bismarck," by R.H. Lutz.

Hamerow, Theodore, editor. Otto von Bismarck: A Historical Assessment. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath, 1962.

Kennan, George F. The Decline of Bismarck's European Order. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.

Kennedy, Paul. The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers. New York: Random House, 1987.

SAVAGE WARFARE

By Joanna Myers

James Fenimore Cooper's novel, The Deerslayer, was published in 1841. It is set in the wilderness of New York in the 1740's during a war between the British and the French. This is the backdrop for the adventures of frontier hero Natty Bumppo, alias Deerslayer. The last of the Leatherstocking Tales, this tale tells of Deerslayer's coming of age, his morals and courage put to the test on his first "warpath".

Raised by the Delaware tribe, but deeply influenced by European Christian morals, Deerslayer attempts to reconcile the differences between the two races. The entire book recounts the adventures of one week in which Deerslayer—along with his rougher hunting companion "Hurry Harry" (the former outlaw Thomas Hutter), Hutter's two daughters Judith and Hetty, Deerslayer's best friend the Delaware warrior Chingachgook and his lover Hist—attempts to defend against the hostile Mingos (Hurons) who are allies with the British-Canadians. For all of the characters, this conflict has lifelong significance. Most of all, it raises questions about the nature of the relationship between American natives and European-Americans.

The hero, Deerslayer, is uniquely American. Free from the moral corruption of the settlements, and with his scrupulous morality enhanced by the beneficial influence of nature, Deerslayer is praised for his honesty, courage, humility, and frontier hardiness. Having been brought up by Indians, he has a good understanding of their nature and beliefs and is willing to defend them, even if they are in conflict with his own. In contrast, Hurry "had all the prejudices and antipathies of a white hunter, who generally regards the Indian as a sort of natural competitor" (40).

Deerslayer gives his general philosophy while arguing with Hurry over the virtues of each race.

God made us al-white, black, and red-and no doubt had his own wise intentions in coloring us differently. Still, he made us, in the main, much the same in feelin's, though I'll not deny that he gave each race its gifts. A white man's gifts are Christianized, while a redskin's are more for the wilderness (41).

Deerslayer acknowledges the differences in the two peoples but, sadly, he is unable to convince his companion, who has hardened his conscience out of necessity, that they deserve equal respect. Nor is he himself able to keep from being drawn into conflict with the Indians. Deerslayer is well-meaning but naive. The respective "gifts" of the Indians and settlers necessarily collide on various levels.

Deerslayer's pacifist convictions are called into account when he finds himself face to face with an Indian who intends to kill him. He exhausts all possibilities for a peaceful departure, only to be deceived by the Indian, who attempts to shoot him as he walks away. Instead Deerslayer, just "the hundredth part of a second too quick for him," fatally wounds him. With a mixture of pride and regret, Deerslayer returns to comfort the Indian until he dies—in his arms. His intentions are the best, but the consequences of his act are more than he can deal with.

The Mingo tribe, seeking revenge for the death of a beloved warrior, takes Deerslayer prisoner, the general consensus among the members being that he should be savagely tortured and burned

that he should be savagely tortured and burned at the stake. Again, the only effective alternative to the sacrifice of Deerslayer's life, which he is prepared to make, is violence. The guns of the officers from a nearby garrison decide the issue, saving the life of the hero, but lowering even further the honor of this tribe and only temporarily forestalling their wrath on the "palefaces".

Deerslayer, who is willing to withhold judgement, to overlook differences, and to forgive his Indian enemies, is still unsuccessful at bringing peace. He has taken a conciliatory position in the conflict, but is ultimately loyal to his race and "gifts." After the battle, he says,

If the young men of this region stood by and suffered the vagabonds to overrun the land, why, we might as well all turn Frenchers at once and give up country and kin. (526)

In order to preserve his, and other white people's lives, he finds he must compromise some Christian morals. For example, in defense of Hetty's reproaches for killing the Huron and therefore disobeying the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," he says, "many things are lawful in war which would be sinful in peace" (472).

In his depiction of frontier warfare, Cooper reflects some of the moral and intellectual movements of his own time. The novel is very concerned with moral issues, especially racism. This was at a time of religious revival and the growth of related reform movements. He also conveys the spirit of romanticism in his portrayal of the Indian Chingachgook as a "noble savage".

In the afterward, Alan Nevins says that Cooper's "real weakness was that he rendered [the Indians] figures of melodrama, not of the real world. He never even studied the subject historically, so that he gives a highly distorted view of the respective roles played by the Algonquin (Dela-

ware) and the Iroquois (Mingo) tribes in our colonial history" (Cooper). If his portrayal of this era in American History is not very accurate, it makes wonderful drama. Cooper reveals much about contemporary American ethics through his hero, Natty Bumppo and, on the whole, he depicts the Native American much more favorably than other popular writers of that period.

Bibliography

Cooper, James Fenimore. The Deerslayer. New York: Signet Classic 1963.

A MAN FOR ALL SEASONS

By Beth Brown

Throughout the play, "A Man For All Seasons," Robert Bolt makes it evident that Sir Thomas More was a man with an excellent 'sense of self'. More's conscience cannot be budged because he knows himself so well. In fact, More's conscience is so purely an embodiment of his "self" that he feels it is necessary for him not to change his mind because he will lose touch with who he is if he does. To accept someone else's understanding of right and wrong calls into question his very existence as a human being. So, when the situation involving King Henry and matrimony becomes tense, More turns to "the law" for protection. He clings to the law to such an extent that his faith in the law actually overwhelms his respect for humanity. More finds that his relationship with God is endangered by the imperatives of his worldly relationship and he counts on the law to resolve this conflict.

One purpose of English law, in More's mind, is to protect his faith in God and the Catholic Church. More believed that the church was present and transcendent throughout the universe and it needed no concrete laws or sanctions to exist. Law is not the method of the Church's authority. But this presents some practical problems as revealed, for instance, in More's debate with his son-in-law to be, Roper, over God's law and man's law. More says, "God's my God. But I find him rather too subtle...I don't know where he is nor what he wants" (Bolt 37). Since to More the Church was so obscure in its concrete direction of lives, in dissecting good and bad, More looked to nations' laws to provide the guidelines for his day-to-day "civil" life. This is seen when More says "I know what's legal, not what's right. And I'll stick to what's legal" (Bolt 37). Again he appeals to law when he observes that "the currents and eddies of right and wrong, which you

[Roper] find such plain sailing, I can't navigate. I'm no voyager. But in the thickets of law, oh, there I'm a forester" (Bolt 37).

Yet More's faith in God, protected by man's laws, gave birth to many of More's ideas, virtues, and beliefs. And these attributes, not his clever use of the law, made up More's character. More had profound self-knowledge. Many people spend most of their lives trying to grasp who they are and usually they fail. More was fortunate to know of what he was "made" and he intended to stick to it. This confidence in his self is clear when More says "but there's a little area where I must rule myself" (Bolt, 34). This area was the core of his selfhood created by the obscure God, and beyond the reach of any man because of the cocoon of the law.

This belief in his self helped develop More's passionate commitment to the law. Throughout More's life in the play, he uses the law to protect his "self". When his ideas went against King Henry VIII's wishes, More chose to be silent because, technically, the tradition in English law was that 'silence gives consent'. Therefore, he would not have to express ideas that could be considered treasonous while neither would he have to violate his self, his conscience. More expressed this when he declared, "Stand on the wrong side of no statute, and no common law. I have not disobeyed my sovereign. I truly believe no man in England is safer than myself" (Bolt 55). More viewed the law as a shelter for all in society. This is apparent when he observes that "the law is a causeway upon which, so long as he keeps to it, a citizen may walk safely." (Bolt, 89)

At first, More's attitude toward the "law" includes a concern for others. For instance, he

invokes the law to protect his family and he exclaims that "whoever hunts for me will find me hiding in the thickets of the law. And I'll hide my daughter with me!" (Bolt 38). More shows concern for society through his belief in the importance of staying true to one's self. "I believe, when statesmen forsake their own private conscience for the sake of their own private duties, they lead their country by a short route to chaos" (Bolt 13). At first, also, More appears to forsake Norfolk and refuse to discuss his problems with Alice entirely in order to protect his friend and his wife. But his motives go deeper.

Although his use of law sometimes reflects a concern about humanity and humans close to him, eventually this devotion to law becomes a commitment for its own sake. More eventually is put to death because he refused even superficially to compromise his beliefs. But he left his family in poverty, his political enemies ascending, and his friends forsaken merely because of his individual need to remain at peace with himself. The law is his instrument of individual righteousness. Since he knew himself so well, he said he wasn't able to "retreat from that final area where he located himself" (Bolt 71). Law and self become intertwined and indivisible.

More states, "I will not give in because I oppose it - I do - not my pride, not my spleen, nor any other of my appetites, but I do...I!" (Bolt, 71)

It would have been easy for him to outwardly change his mind and approve Henry's marriage to Anne, but his need to stay true to himself and to prove that the law protects such behavior prevented this even though the behavior might have better served his family, his friends, and his country's political future. Ultimately, More does not approve of Henry's marriage because he will not swear an oath. To him an oath is plainly an invitation to God to act as a witness and a judge. He could not do this even in exchange for restoring his family and friendships. Both his individu-

alism and his belief in God are seen when he tells Meg, "When a man takes an oath, Meg, he's holding his own self in his hands like water. And if he opens his fingers then he needn't hope to find himself again" (Bolt 81).

Bibliography

Robert Bolt. A Man For All Seasons. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

THE POPULARIZATION OF ABOLITIONISM

By Gary Helmling

The abolitionist movement of antebellum American society, although suffering from both regional and ideological divisions, was united behind a high moral standard of racial equality and played a decisive role in the defense of human rights. While only partially successful, it provided a precedent for humanitarian reforms for years to come. In his book The Abolitionist: The Growth of a Dissenting Minority, Merton L. Dillon discusses the building of the abolitionists from supporters of the ideals of the Revolution into an organized minority that was to a great extent responsible for the downfall of slavery in the United States and with it the collapse of southern dominance in the federal government.

Through the book Dillon explores the development of the abolitionist movement from its start in the isolated efforts of reformers and philanthropists of the 1790's to the establishment of cohesive abolitionist organizations in the 1830's and finally to its dissolution in the 1870's. Over this time frame Dillon describes abolitionist concerns and tactic in relation to changing American values and sentiments. Although they were united on the goals of freeing the black slaves and integrating them into a society devoid of racial prejudice, the abolitionists disputed the methods for accomplishing these ends. In the 1830's, when the abolitionists first began to exert their influence cooperatively, the North was free from the institution of slavery, but Northerners were far from ready to accept the abolitionists' condemnation of it. A high degree of racial prejudice throughout the country and the popular rejection of extremism kept the abolitionists in the state of a persecuted minority. Thus the first abolitionist policies sought the help of the church to create a revolution in American moral-

ity, which would result in the voluntary emancipation of the slaves and their assumption of an equal role in society. After some twenty years of the publication of abolitionist journals such as Garrison's Liberator and the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society's National Era, and countless public lectures, the abolitionists still remained a minority. The church had not taken a strong anti-slavery stand, and racial prejudice still abounded. Thus many disillusioned abolitionists turned to political action for reform. Dillon discusses the growth of disunionist feelings from this disillusionment and again shows the fluctuation of abolitionist attitudes when they reacted with strong support to President Lincoln's call to keep the Union intact.

In his history of abolitionism, Dillon focuses on the accomplishments and ideologies of a few individuals as exemplary of the factions within the abolitionist movement. William Lloyd Garrison was one of the most radical supporters of the movement. He had split with the clergy on their lack of commitment to the abolitionist effort and denounced the Constitution as condoning slavery. He also favored the policy of disunionism in reaction to the annexation of Texas. Theodore Weld favored a strictly moral approach to the question of slavery, disregarding its economic and political aspects. Unfortunately, even the abolitionists were somewhat divided by race as many black abolitionists such as Frederick Douglass accepted more radical measures, including the use of violence, as means of bringing about the end of slavery.

The main thrust of Dillon's analysis of the abolitionist movement is the growth of the abolitionists from the powerless voice of protest of the

early nineteenth century to a dissenting body influential in destroying the institution of slavery. Dillon views the critical period in this change as the 1840's and the 1850's, when the abolitionists were already well established and starting to shift from the effort to persuade the populace of the moral wrong of slavery to an involvement in political activity. Through their own political involvement the abolitionists drew the public eye to Southern involvement in national politics. Southern predominance in the federal government, Dillon asserts, aroused anti-South feelings and fears of encroachment on human rights by the "slave power" lent more support to the abolitionist movement than it could possibly have gained on its own. The annexation of Texas brought sectionalism to the forefront of national politics. Abolitionists claimed it was evidence of the influence of the "slave power" in the government and launched an extensive propaganda campaign against it. Their failure caused many to give up hope and follow a disunionist policy, but more importantly the event strengthened the resentment of Southern expansionism in the North. The strict enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Law included in the Compromise of 1850 also angered many Northerners, who felt that this was an intrusion on their own civil rights. These events set the stage for the secession of seven southern states from the Union in 1861. With war with the south imminent, the abolitionists again launched a propaganda campaign. This time it resulted in an outpouring of anti-southern sentiment and gained popular support for the emancipation of the slaves.

The portrayal of the abolitionists by Dillon closely follows the evolution of the movement, correlating it with the development of abolitionist methods. The organization of the abolitionists, united behind the goal of emancipation of the slaves, but split into factions over how to achieve this, is thus also well defined and the different viewpoints of the abolitionists are clearly seen. Dillon also stresses the importance of anti-southern feelings

and sectional crises, such as the annexation of Texas, in gaining popular support for the abolitionists.

Merton L. Dillon illustrates the growth of abolitionism out of the ideals of freedom central to the American Revolution. The abolitionists wanted to carry on the revolution in order to extend personal freedom and civil liberties to all branches of society. Although this was first attempted in Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation of 1863 and later more completely enacted in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution, many abolitionists considered their movement a failure. As Dillon explains, the abolitionists, who had advocated a moral revolution, felt that "because abolition has been accomplished by force and not as a consequence of moral conviction, its gains would not last" (p.264). They were quite right in their predictions of the problems that unchanged racial prejudice would cause.

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

By Sarah Hoisington

Benjamin Franklin was all-American. He was clever, practical, ambitious, and successful. He founded libraries, volunteer fire departments, and civic clubs; and he invented efficient heating devices that his countrymen continue to use today. However, Franklin also was a realist who recognized his deficiencies, especially his difficulty with public speaking. The first part of his Autobiography acts as a moral guide to show his son the path to success. The second part used Franklin's own life as an example of how a good man is capable of becoming better. This is Franklin's testimony to his own virtue. The story is left unfinished and it is up to the reader to imagine what new achievements await Franklin.

Born in Boston, Massachusetts, Franklin was the youngest son in a family of thirteen. His relationship with his father was positive. They got along well. Franklin senior made his children aware of the good and just conduct of life. He tried to improve his children's minds by bringing useful topics of conversation to the dinner table. At the age of ten, Ben began assisting his father in his business, the dyeing trade. He disliked this trade and later served as an apprentice to his brother, James, in the printing business. Unfortunately, James and Ben often quarreled. Ben began to write anonymously for the newspaper and later he dominated his brother's business.

While Ben was growing up, he found friends among other studious boys. Ben and his closest friend, John Collins, often argued because they liked to debate and broaden their knowledge. They both were avid readers and Ben learned much from Collins through their discussions. Since conversation was not a strong point for Ben, he began to pay closer attention to his

manner of writing. One of his friends commented, "In his common conversation he seems to have no choice of words: he hesitates and blunders; and yet, good God! how he writes!" (46) Ben later became a notable writer and often published his works in journals. Ben's associates were all lovers of reading. He formed a club called the Junto and most of his friends were members. They had weekly meetings and would read essays written by each other and engage in debate. Ben did not have many opponents. However, some who disliked him thought he did not make the most of life because he always followed a strict routine. He was in fact a disciplined person and a perfectionist. Others thought that he was selfish and what he wrote was only used to manipulate others. Still others were jealous because he became a successful owner of a printing business.

Throughout his lifetime, Ben Franklin made many contributions. His various ideas and inventions have been a blessing to America. His first project of a public nature was for a public library. Ben drew up the proposals and obtained a charter. The library, the first of all American public libraries, was an important contribution because it helped improve the education and knowledge of the people. In 1732 Ben Franklin published an almanac entitled Poor Richard's Almanack. This was a way to communicate useful information among the common people who scarcely brought any other books. He filled it with proverbs such as "It is hard for an empty sack to stand upright" (93). He wrote that frugality was the way to become wealthy and secure virtue. Ben Franklin's newspaper, the Spectator, was another vehicle for information and instruction. He filled it with essays written by himself and other mor-

alists. Ben wrote an essay about the usefulness of forming a company whose purpose was to extinguish fires. He formed the first company called the Union Fire Company. After fire companies appeared, Philadelphia never lost more than one or two houses at a time due to fire. In 1742, Ben invented an open stove that more effectively warmed rooms while at the same time saving fuel. Ben believed in educating the poor and wrote a proposal for opening and supporting a free academy; in 1749 the school opened. Students increased so rapidly that a larger building had to be found. The Philadelphia Assembly was so impressed with the schools that they established the present University of Pennsylvania. Franklin drew up a proposal for paving the city streets which would end the amount of dirt and dust blowing around the city and light the streets as well. He also had great success with scientific experiments. He wrote many papers about electricity and received a medal from the Royal Society.

Benjamin Franklin wanted to better society and his innovative ideas and positive outlook helped him to do this. Unselfishly, he strived to contribute beneficially to the people who surrounded him. His ideas enlightened others who then felt driven to act and help the community. Without a doubt, Franklin promoted change and bettered the world.

Franklin possessed many special leadership qualities. He was an experienced, practical, virtuous, wise, and good man. He was multi-talented: a writer, debater, inventor, and club member. His ideas, such as starting a public library and forming a fire company, showed his independent and practical side. He was a very intelligent man. He founded the Junto club and was an important member. He often dominated discussions and was looked up to by many of his associates. He was promoted in almost every job he undertook, which demonstrates his abilities. The governor of Pennsylvania even asked Ben to

take charge of the Northwest frontier and raise troops to build a line of forts. Franklin was continually working; reading was the only amusement that he allowed himself. There was no time for play. He was a busy and determined man. Ben mastered French, Italian, Spanish, and Latin. He was very exact and set up a daily chart with precisely how much time he should spend on each activity. Ben was open to other people's opinions and advice. One of his friends told him that he was considered proud and that it showed in conversation. Franklin worked to overcome this problem for many weeks until he rid himself of it.

Benjamin Franklin was a remarkable eighteenth-century man who carefully searched to discover what was practical and useful and therefore best, and patched his ideas together in a way which served him effectively. Franklin demonstrated during his life how the many opportunities presented in the new world of America might be met with diligent work and wise management. Ben knew his limitations but also his talents. He used them successfully so that he could move ahead and he did.

THE HEALING POWER OF LAUGHTER

By Nicole Zaccaria

"If you think you have caught a cold, call in a doctor..call in three doctors and play bridge."

- Robert Benchley

In 1964, Norman Cousins came back from a trip abroad only to be hospitalized. The illness started as a slight fever while he was flying home. Eventually, it intensified until he was barely able to move his neck, arms, hands, fingers, and legs. After several blood tests and many specialists, Norman Cousins was diagnosed as suffering from ankylosing spondylitis, a serious collagen illness-which caused the disintegration of connective tissue in his spine. The doctors were honest with him and explained that he did not have a good chance of living. In fact, it was said that he had a one in five hundred chance of recovering. Norman Cousins decided he had better act quickly.

It seemed clear to me that if I was to be that one in five hundred, I had better be something more than a passive observer. I remembered having read Hans Selye's classic book, "The Stress of Life". With great clarity, Selye showed that adrenal exhaustion could be caused by emotional tension, such as frustration or suppressed rage. He detailed the negative effects of the emotions on body chemistry. The inevitable question arose in my mind. What about the positive emotions? If negative emotions produce negative chemical changes in the body, wouldn't the positive emotions produce positive chemical changes? Is it possible that love, hope, faith, laughter, confidence,

and the will to live have the therapeutic value? Do chemical changes occur only on the downside?" (Cousins 1979, 34).

Norman decided he wanted to be free of the hospital. He made arrangements to move into a hotel. According to Cousins, a hotel would be much better for any seriously ill person because of the "lack of sanitation in the hospitals, the rapidity with which staphylococci and other organisms can run through an entire hospital, the extensive and sometimes promiscuous use of x-ray equipment, the regularity with which hospital routine takes precedence over the rest requirements of the patient, and perhaps the hospital's most serious failure was in the area of nutrition" (Cousins 29). Cousins decided to stop taking all aspirins and pain-killers. "It was unreasonable to expect positive chemical changes to take place so long as my body was being saturated with, and toxified by, pain-killing medications" (Cousins 1979, 36).

Norman Cousins then took the plunge and had an abundance of funny movies brought to him. These included several old Marx Brothers films and candid camera excerpts.

Miraculously, it worked! I made the joyous discovery that ten minutes of genuine belly laughter had an anesthetic effect and would give me at least two hours of pain-free sleep. When the pain-killing effect of the laughter wore off, we would switch on the motion-picture projector again,

and, not infrequently, it would lead to another pain-free sleep interval. Sometimes, the nurse read to me out of a trove of humor books" (Cousins. 1979, 40).

Along with laughter, Cousins combined doses of vitamin C for the process of combating collagen breakdown. The combination worked, and cut heavily into whatever poison was attacking the connective tissue. Consequently, the fever and pulse drastically reduced. Norman Cousins's body has continued to improve and presently he is able to do numerous activities that his doctors previously thought would be impossible. Although he is slower and it is tougher, he is able to play piano, horseback ride, and play tennis and golf.

Since Cousins's story, there has been continual research on the effect laughter has on the healing process. Of course, there are many varied and conflicting theories. In his book, Dr. Raymond Moody points out the lack of solid evidence regarding humor therapy. Many doctors agree that actual laughter is irrelevant in curing a human. They feel all our healing capacities exist solely in our mind. Where is that? Many medical theories state that if we believe that laughter is working, and we have a unique will to live, we will indeed cure ourselves. This is not a new theory, however. A quote from Socrates gives us an idea of the age of this type of belief: "As it is not proper to cure the eyes without the head, nor the head without the body, so neither is it proper to cure the body without the soul." (Moody 107). Many years later, Sigmund Freud also strongly believed in the link between the will to survive and the sense of humor:

Like wit and the comic, humour has in it a liberating element. But it has also some thing fine and elevating, which is lacking in the other two ways of deriving pleasure

from intellectual activity. Obviously, what is fine about it is the triumph of narcissism, the ego's victorious assertion of its own invulnerability. It refuses to be hurt by the arrows of reality or to be compelled to suffer. It insists that it is impervious to wounds dealt by the outside world, in fact, that these are merely occasions for affording it pleasure. This last trait is a fundamental characteristic of humour (Moody 115).

Contesting this view is the amazing research which shows that the healing power of laughter is not merely a part of our mind, but the cause of many physical improvements on our state of being. Brain researchers speculate that laughter induces the release of endorphines, chemicals which are the body's own pain killer and similar to morphine. Another reason laughter decreases pain is that when a person is presented with a humorous stimulus, he laughs, and the tension of his muscles in the affected area decreases (Moody 1978).

Despite conflicting ideas about why and how laughter substitutes for a pain-killer, many experiments verify its effectiveness. In one experiment, researchers at Texas Tech University showed that students who had first listened to a humorous tape could withstand the discomfort of a steadily tightening blood-pressure cuff more than students who had listened to an informative narrative or a relaxation tape, or who hadn't listened to any material before hand (Cousins 1989).

But pain relief is not the only benefit laughter produces. Laughter stimulates relaxation as well. "When laughter bursts, your metabolism picks up, muscles get massaged, and neurochemicals stream into the blood. You feel relaxed—and

you've raised your guard against depression, heart disease, and pain" (Lang 42).

Anxiety can cause tension in the neck and head muscles and produce a headache. When a person with one of these unconsciously self-generated headaches, backaches, or other tension pain is made to laugh, the tension may be relieved (Peter 8).

Laughter also increases immune-cell production: "Now researchers think laughter may empower the immune system as well...Negative emotions can manipulate the immune system and it now seems positive ones can do something similar." says Lee S. Berk, an immunologist at Loma Linda University School of Medicine in California. "Cortisol, which is an immune suppressor, has a tremendous influence on the immune system. Laughter decreases cortisol, which allows interleukin-2 and other immune boosters to express themselves" (Lang, 42).

Laughter is also a form of exercise. It exercises the lungs and stimulates the circulatory system. Hearty laughter causes full action of the diaphragm. The whole cardiovascular system benefits from robust laughter because the deep respiration that accompanies it increases the oxygen in the blood. Immediately following the climax of humor, the chest, abdomen, and face get a vigorous workout. In convulsive laughter, where the individual really breaks up, even the legs and arms are involved. During the laughter response, the body is revitalized by what sometimes is called internal massage (Peter).

Although researchers offer conflicting opinions regarding the beneficial effects of laughter, none can dispute its power to improve our lives, whether by acting on our bodies or our souls. With this

report I am not trying to sell you on the healing power of laughter, I am just trying to make you realize and ponder what we as humans are capable of. I see many depressed people who are incapable of enjoying the simple things in life. I am trying to remind people of laughter before it passes them by. What could be better than laughing and having fun and also having it be good for you? Come on, how many healthy things are truly fun? I would just like to leave you with a quote from Norman Cousins which really inspired me and I hope will do the same for you:

Hope, faith, love, humor, and a strong will to live offer no promise of immortality, only proof of our uniqueness as human beings and the opportunity to experience full growth even under the grimmest circumstances. Far more real than the ticking of time is the way we open up the minutes and invest them with meaning. Death is not the ultimate tragedy in life. The ultimate tragedy is to die without discovering the possibilities of full growth! (Cousins)

Bibliography

Cousins, Norman, "Norman Cousins Helps Other Patients As He Once Helped Himself-By Laughing". Good Housekeeping. Nov. 1989, p.92-96.

Cousins, Norman. Anatomy of an Illness. W. W. Norton and Company, Inc. 1979.

Lang, Susan. "Laughter Is The Best Defense". American Health. Dec. 1988 p. 42.

Moody, Dr. Raymond A. Jr. Laugh After Laugh. Florida: Headwaters Press, 1978.

Peter, Dr. Laurence J. The Laughter Prescription. New York: Random House Inc., 1982.

MODERN ADAPTATIONS TO ARISTOTLE

By Mark Humowiecki

The question of whether we are objects of determinism or agents of free will is fundamental to how we approach our lives, assess moral blame, and coexist with others. Without a belief in free will it is impossible for us to assign any blame because we would have absolutely no choice in what we do. Criminals would be the most unfortunate in our society and the most deserving of pity. Luckily our society does not subscribe to this idea. We believe in fundamental rights which would not exist in a world where action is determined. Likewise, we find people guilty of crimes. The guilty verdict implies more than just a deed committed; it also implies a conscious, free decision to commit such an act. If we believe in unfettered free will, we should punish based on the crime and not the criminal. The trend in the criminal justice system today seems to be toward a predetermined punishment without regard to mitigating circumstances. Although it may be in an attempt to remove judicial discretion or possible racism, this system assumes absolute free will and claims that certain people are just more evil than the rest of us. I think this is unfortunate because I believe that there truly are cases of mitigated free will. There should be corresponding reduction in the amount of blame attributed to the individual.

My theory concerning determinism is based on Aristotle's self-determinism, modified by the insights of the social sciences. I think Aristotle would rejoice in the understanding of human behavior that the modern social sciences have provided. As Frederick Copleston puts it, "Aristotle asserts that it is political or social science which studies the good for man" (83). If he knew about the twentieth century discoveries in the social sciences, I imagine that Aristotle would

say there is a continuum of determinism based on such theories as Maslow's needs hierarchy. Aristotle advocates the development of virtue, moral and intellectual, through training as a prerequisite to self-control and true freedom. Accordingly, she who is self-actualized is most free, with the largest range of choices and the greatest opportunity for success. That person's personality is not rigid and she can behave rationally and flexibly. On the other end of the spectrum is the impoverished person whose freedom may be severely limited by pressing economic needs. Considering Maslow, this person does not have the luxury of attending to needs of self-love and self-actualization, but rather must attempt to meet basic survival needs. A mother of six in Cabrini Green must be concerned with the pragmatic goal of providing food and protecting her children from gang activity. Thus, she does not have the opportunity, nor perhaps the interest, to pursue higher education. This results in seeing a limited range of possible behavior and is one reason why poverty tends to occur in an unending cycle unless some extraneous factor is powerful enough to break that cycle.

Fortunately, someone can become more free during their lifetime, especially through an inner strength, community or family influence, or perhaps divine intervention. This theory is supported by the example of Jean Valjean, the main character in *Les Misérables*, who is able to bring himself up out of a life on a chain gang to become mayor of a town. We also witness this type of change when people recover from addictions through Alcoholics Anonymous or drug rehabilitation.

A limitation in Aristotle's original reasoning was

that the Greeks did not believe that major changes in character could occur. In contrast, Victor Frankl believed that "the last of the human freedoms is the ability to choose one's attitude in a given set of circumstances" (104). This freedom of self is not always expected because it is so difficult, but it is to be commended by society. One's freedom is not solely restricted by economics and addictions, but also by social status, education, moral training, heredity, mental state, and, most importantly, environment. If one is never exposed to anything but evil and is never loved, she is more likely to feel hatred towards society and act similarly to how she has seen others act. No one can be expected to have an idea of a greater good or moral right unless it has been positively reinforced. Any time a person is more prone to an action, she is less responsible for that action because it takes more effort to avert it. This fact provides a rationale for assessing blame in our world. For example, it is commonly known that the parent who was abused as a child is much more likely to abuse his own child. As a society we should attempt to help these parents by teaching them constructive methods of child-rearing that use alternatives to physical punishment. If they have greater insight into the relationship between their childhood and their parental behavior they are more likely to be free and choose not to abuse their children.

In his *Ethics* Aristotle argues that the way to moral behavior is through the development of virtues which not only are admirable traits, but must also be conscious, habitual actions, regularly manifested by one's character as an end in themselves. We are not born with them, but if we are lucky enough we can be educated and develop them. Once this is accomplished, we can be moral and free (Velasquez and Barry 79-82).

Our legal, moral, and social systems should be based on the premise that there are degrees of freedom which vary from individual to individual. If one's privation leads towards something

illegal or socially unacceptable, the person may be held less responsible for these actions. In the case of Charles Manson, for example, this perspective relieves a lot of his blame, but not all of it. Manson, because of his past, was certainly more prone to commit violence than I would be. His childhood, a time of very important personal growth and shaping of the individual, was spent in a very destructive environment. His hardening within the prison atmosphere led him toward immoral actions. But to say that he is entirely powerless to overcome his predilections is erroneous in my view. The fact that others have gone through similar environments and not committed such heinous crimes suggests that Manson still had some freedom (Wooden). There was always the freedom to kill or not to kill. We cannot expect him to live the model life, but we must insist that he meet certain minimal standards of conduct, including respect for life. His clearly calculated set of murders violated society's basic fabric and must be punished. Just to say that he is not fully responsible does not mean that we cannot put him in prison. We also need to protect society. We must incapacitate him, perhaps even with the additional purpose of trying to rehabilitate him. Our attempt should be to teach the irresponsible offender some basic values about society. In this way we can help the criminal become freer. One of the challenges that faces our society is the balance between protecting the rights of society and the rights of the criminal. If one were totally free or totally determined, this would not be a problem. I see this dilemma as further proof that the position that recognizes that a person is neither totally free nor totally determined is valid.

Using this view we can reconcile the idea of moral responsibility with the theories of the social sciences. Becoming free should be a high goal for any person, but with it comes increased responsibility for one's actions and perhaps for the greater society one lives in. The large range of choices that accompany the freedom of self-actualization

makes it worth the added responsibility.

Bibliography

Copleston, Frederick. The History of Philosophy Volume I, Part 2. Garden City: Image Books, 1967.

Frankl, Victor E. Man's Search For Meaning. New York: Washington Square Press, 1963.

Valasquez, Manuel and Barry, Vincent. Philosophy: A Text With Readings. Third Edition. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1988.

Wooden, Kenneth. Weeping in the Playtime of Others. New York: McGraw Hill, 1976.

MEXICO

By Tina Marsico

While vacationing in Mexico, I enjoyed visiting the Mayan ruins at Tulum, Coba, and Chichen Itza. Mayan architecture and art are world-renowned. The buildings, artifacts, and design of Chichen Itza are particularly striking. Chichen Itza is one of the largest Mayan sites. It covers thousands of acres and includes about fifty buildings.

One of the most impressive structures is the Castle or the Pyramid of Kulkulkan. Many archaeologists believe that this pyramid represented a calendar for the Maya. Each of the four sides of the pyramid has ninety-one steps. With the platform on top, the total is 365, the number of days in a year. The seasons are represented by the four sides. There are eighteen corners of the platform, the number of months in the Mayan calendar.

Each year during the spring and fall equinoxes, a phenomenal event occurs: a shadow forms from the edges of the pyramid when the sun sets. This shadow joins a stone serpent's head carved at the bottom of the stairs. Together they resemble an undulating serpent.

My visit to Chichen Itza left me impressed with the capabilities of man. The calculations and engineering behind creating this phenomenon are extraordinary. The lack of computers, calculators, and modern architectural tools makes this artifact truly amazing. These simple people combined their religious beliefs and architectural skills to create a structure that would please their gods. I have great admiration and respect for the motivation, hard work, and dedication represented by this remarkable work of architecture. Little did they know how long their pyra-

mid would survive to impress and influence countless generations in the future.

THE EFFECT OF THE DEPRESSION ON MY GRANDFATHER

By Lori Lynch

My grandfather, Walter Lynch, was nine years old when the depression hit. As a boy he had little time to play because he always had jobs to do around the house. He had to help his dad cut wood for the fire with a two-man saw. My grandfather also had to help with the laundry. His mother would fill up a large kettle with hot water and scrub the clothes clean. Then my grandfather would wring the clothes out with the wringer.

When there was time to play, he and his friends invented games, as money was scarce. They played kick the can, spun tops, and played with yo-yos. The girls usually played with jacks or would jump rope. When my grandfather gathered enough friends, they'd play a game of baseball. When the ball had ripped, they would tape it and after a few games were playing with a ball of tape. The Board of Education had fine playgrounds for the children, supplying them with bats, balls, footballs, and volleyballs. When it rained, the kids would gather in a playground shelter where they could play ping pong or checkers. My grandfather's playground group would compete with other playground groups to see who was better, but the competitions would always be cut short as fights broke out.

My grandfather would also have to find time to do his daily homework. He attended a parochial school of sixty students, where he used second-hand books because they cost less. Clothes torn at school or while playing were either sewn or patched. If a pair of socks had a hole in them, they weren't thrown away, but mended. NOTHING was taken for granted—my grandfather still has a tendency to saving things. A month ago, my grandfather sorted through some "junk" and began throwing it away. Still, he saved half of it.

As a boy, my grandfather loved milk, but it was too expensive to drink every day. The milk was delivered to the house by a horse and wagon on the days it could be afforded. It seemed as though all food was unfathomably expensive during the depression. A fifteen pound bag of potatoes was fifteen cents, and a dozen bananas was fifteen cents, or two dozen for twenty five cents. People who didn't have enough money for food went on welfare. My grandfather's family was too proud to go on welfare. My grandfather's neighbors on welfare seemed to eat better than he did. To keep a small quantity of food purchased fresh, every family had an ice box. My grandfather always felt sorry for the man when he had to climb four flights of stairs to deliver the ice.

Thanksgiving was one of my grandfather's favorite holidays. All his relatives would come to his house and each gave him five cents. The night before, each family would purchase a goose, pluck the feathers and make pillows out of them. My grandfather recalls that for dessert, the family would always eat watermelon. There were fruit peddlers who would walk up and down the street trying to sell their goods. To see if the watermelon was ripe, the peddler could cut a triangle out, and if it wasn't ripe my grandfather's mother couldn't waste her money on buying it.

For entertainment, my grandfather loved to listen to the radio. His favorite shows were "Lights Out", and "The Shadow". They were scary shows requiring the use of imagination. The next day, all the kids would talk about the shows they had listed to. He also liked to listen to the songs played on the radio. "Back In Your Own Backyard", "Me and My Shadow", and "Strike Up The Band" were among his favorites. Baseball and

boxing were also on the radio. People would stand on the corner by the candy store and talk about the fights for hours. Baseball games were expensive, but my grandfather saved enough money to go to some of them. The cleaners would give a customer half a cent for every hanger brought back. Also, for entertainment, people would go downtown and see a movie. The many movie theaters downtown always featured a stage show before playing the film. The movies cost ten cents for children and fifteen cents for adults. My grandfather never had the money to see the movies. The transportation downtown was also expensive. The street car cost three cents for children and seven cents for adults. Few owned cars, and those who did were considered extremely rich. My grandfather recalls having to walk everywhere he had to go.

Newspapers were also a big part of entertainment. The Tribune and the Sun-Times were two cents weekly, and the Herald and the Post were three cents each. My grandfather remembers reading about Babe Ruth and Charles Lindbergh. His favorite past time was to go to the amusement park on Addison Street called Riverview. Riverview was as exciting to children then as Disneyland is now.

When people look back and say, "Those were the good old days," my grandfather is confused. Although the depression brought his family and many families closer together, he asked, "Were those really the good old days?" Living in a house with no electricity and no gas heating; going to bed when it was cold and seeing your breath; having to wear long wool underwear to keep warm (coal cost a dollar a ton at the coal yard); not having indoor plumbing and using an outhouse every time you had to go to the bathroom-my grandfather asks, "Does that sound like the good old days to you?"

TRULY UNDERAGE: FETAL ALCOHOL SYNDROME AND ITS EFFECT ON THE BRAIN

By Jennifer Burton

"Guess what honey-I talked to the doctor today and she says I'm pregnant!"

"A baby?" "Wow, that's great! Let's celebrate. I'll open up that bottle of champagne we have been saving for a special occasion."

This is an all too familiar scenario. Drinking even one drink is one of the worst mistakes this woman could make. It is estimated that in the United States each year 50,000 babies are born already affected by alcohol. That is approximately two percent of all babies born alive (Miller). The effects on the infant could be anything from slight hyperactivity to severe mental retardation or death. This condition, called Fetal Alcohol Syndrome (FAS), is named by the U.S. Journal of Drugs and Alcohol Dependence as the third most common birth defect in this country.

A link between alcohol and deformities and miscarriages was made as early as the eighteenth century. At this time there was what was called a gin epidemic, where suddenly people began to drink more and more gin. In 1736 a report was sent into Parliament from Middlesex that the people in that area were drinking to an excess.

With regard to the female sex, we find the contagion has spread even among them, and that to a degree hardly possible to be conceived. Unhappy mothers habituate themselves to these distilled liquors, whose children are born

weak and sickly, and often look shriveled and old as though they had numbered many years (Abel 11).

Later in 1751 William Hogarth illustrated alcohol abuse of the times with his well known painting "Gin Lane". Parts of the painting show a baby falling from a drunk woman's arms and another shows a nurse pouring gin down a baby's throat. Despite these startling revelations, FAS was not identified as a disease until the early 1970's (Abel). This is probably because the technology was not available to study the physical aspects of the brain, nor did we have the knowledge to understand them until this time.

Some symptoms of Fetal Alcohol Syndrome in infants are small size, low birth weight, abnormally small head, weak heart or kidney problems, trouble bending or moving their arms or legs or severe mental retardation. In addition, many infants also have distinctive facial abnormalities including a flattish appearance, narrow squinting eyes with drooping lids, thin upper lip, blunt jaw and receding chin. Other common facial deformities include ears placed low and far back on the head which leads to loss of hearing, and the lack of an indentation (called the philtrum) on the upper lip. The upper lip and nose are also sometimes placed far apart. Infants afflicted with FAS generally fail to develop and thrive. Fetal Alcohol Syndrome can manifest itself to different degrees. Although in many instances FAS can be detected at birth or around the age of three, these effects are often not identified until the child begins school. Some symp-

toms of modified FAS include mild mental retardation, hyperactivity, abnormal sleeping patterns, perceptual disabilities or failure to gain weight and grow normally (FAS Work Group, 1980).

This failure to thrive is visible in Sterling Clarren's experiments with baby Macaques. Normally these animals are lively and curious about everything. However, the macaques whose mothers were given alcohol during pregnancy are lifeless and uninterested by their surroundings (Restak). Human infants often show the same symptoms of detachment along with an anti-social attitude. Many of these children don't like to be touched or held and cry often.

The first trimester of a woman's pregnancy is by far the most critical. It is during this time that the fetus goes through organogenesis. This is when the fertilized egg divides thousands of times, each cell constantly differentiating. Because of this, alcohol consumption during the first three months of pregnancy can yield gross birth defects, severe mental retardation among them (Clarren, video). It is estimated that twenty percent of the mentally retarded population are disabled because of alcohol, making "FAS the number one threat to children's mental health, greater than either Downs syndrome or spina bifida" (Dorfman, 60).

During the first trimester the brain is forming continually. Therefore, if alcohol is affecting its development, deformities are not uncommon. The reason alcohol has such devastating effects is because the cells that migrate to different parts of the brain are predestined to stop at a particular location, but alcohol causes these cells to not know when to stop. With regard to the nervous system, the axons and dendrites affected by alcohol have difficulties making connections

and with their organization. Neurons also travel around the brain, "lost." The alcohol seems to affect the organization or sometimes cause the premature breakdown of the glial cells needed for neuronal migration. In a study of rats, Michael W. Miller found that consumption of the equivalent to twelve ounces of beer in humans per day caused neurons to either fail to reach their proper destination or to die entirely (Miller). This could very possibly be the result in humans as well.

Other common problems involve the white matter of the brain. The ventricles are often far too large, brain density is greatly reduced and the overall size of the brain is smaller. Alcohol also is known to cause problems with hormones, peptides, and neurotransmitters (Clarren, video).

During the second and third trimesters, because the fetus's brain is a little more developed so the damage to the brain may be slightly less, but it is during this time that the fetus's body develops. The most distinctive deformities are those of the face, as mentioned earlier, and deformities of the hands. The mother must also keep in mind, during the last four or five months of her pregnancy especially, that the baby feels the effects of amounts of alcohol at least as much as the mother. If a woman has a few drinks and is only slightly intoxicated baby is "drinking" the same amount of alcohol and this could make the baby "drunk."

Many defects of those with Fetal Alcohol Syndrome include abnormalities in the development of the cerebral cortex, particularly in motor areas. These abnormalities include language and coordinative difficulties and deficiencies in cognitive and fine motor skills. It is partially because of these defects in the motor cortex that the

brain is of reduced size and that it is in a sheetlike formation rather than the normal clusters of cells.

Another area of the brain which has been found to be greatly affected by FAS is the hippocampus. Within the hippocampus of rats studied, there were aberrations in the organization of fibers. They were abnormally distributed and there were fewer nerve cells and decreased dendritic size (Abel). Since the hippocampus controls learning and memory, and because it is from here we derive our inhibitions, the hippocampus could be responsible for the second most common symptom of Fetal Alcohol Syndrome—hyperactivity.

Hyperactivity, also called minimal brain dysfunction or attention deficit disorder, is characterized by an inability to focus on anything for long periods of time and a tendency toward impulsiveness. This disorder is usually evident by age three but is sometimes not found until the child enters school. "As a result of this disorder, school failure and conduct disorders are not uncommon" (Abel 141). Hyperactivity is usually only a problem during childhood, but in some cases it does continue into adolescence and even adulthood. Sometimes the hyperactivity goes away entirely. More commonly, when the child grows up, the hyperactivity goes away but the individual retains attention problems and the characteristic impulsiveness (Abel).

There are several studies going on now about the effect of sperm damaged by alcohol and the way they effect the fetus but as of yet these results have been indecisive. Therefore, at the present time, the responsibility rests on the mother's shoulders. Alcoholic women are the group at the greatest risk simply because they are the ones

who will need the most help in stopping drinking. Other women must also be alert and stop drinking even if they are not sure if they are pregnant. As mentioned earlier, the most severe damage is done during the first trimester. Some women do not find out they are pregnant until well into their pregnancy when it is too late. Drinking during the second and third trimesters does yield more subtle effects, but nevertheless, they should not be taken lightly. It has also been found that binge drinking can do just as much damage as drinking every day.

Fetal Alcohol Syndrome is unlike many other diseases. It cannot be cured once the damage is done, but it is entirely preventable. Before we can prevent the spread of FAS, parents must know about the damage they could be causing their child. Across the country people are trying to educate each other about the dangers. First of all, now that doctors and other people in the medical profession are aware of the disease and what causes it, they can notify their patients. Secondly, a law was put into effect as of November of 1989 saying that alcohol now needs to carry a cigarette-type warning, cautioning the drinker that the consumption of that beverage may cause birth defects. Finally, awareness campaigns are being put forth in different parts of the country. For example, many of the bars in California now have posted displays, warning pregnant women not to drink (Raetzman). When examining statistics, the drop since the disease was recognized in 1972 and since these programs began is visible. Since this time, there have been declines in the number and severity of cases in the United States. Even though Fetal Alcohol Syndrome can be stopped entirely, this disease will continue to be responsible for hundreds of deaths, deformities, and handicaps until women realize the danger they are putting their child in.

Is it worth all those evening cocktails and happy hour beers to have a child who could be deformed and/or mentally retarded for his whole life? This child never had a chance to determine his fate. His mom's alcohol use destroyed that right. This child's life has ended before it has had a chance to begin.

Bibliography

Abel, Ernest. Fetal Alcohol Syndrome and Fetal Alcohol Effects. New York: Plenum Press. 1984.

Dorfman, Andrea. "Alcohol's Youngest Victims." Time August 28, 1989. 60.

Fetal Alcohol Syndrome Work Group. For Your Baby's Sake, Don't Drink. December, 1980.

Miller, Michael W. "Effects of Alcohol on the Generation and Migration of Cerebral Cortical Neurons". Science. September, 1986. 1308-10.

Raetzman, Kim RN. Interview on 2/18/90 at Evanston Hospital, Evanston, Illinois.

Restak, Richard M. The Mind. New York: Bantam Books. 1988.

CAMPFIRE CHATTER

By Terry O'Brien

Jean struggled out of the twisted wreck and started running, trying to put as much distance as possible between himself and the burning plane. He soon realized he was safe and, exhausted, slowed down to a walk. In the middle of a forest he tried to gather his bearings. He soon grew close to a state of panic. Blindly stumbling along, he heard the sound of rushing water. He ran in the direction of this noise until he came upon the stream and, with great relief, got down on his knees and drank until he was content. Feeling eyes upon him, he glanced up to see a man staring curiously at him.

"Hello," said the man, "What's your name?"

"How do you do. My name is Jean-Jacques Rousseau."

"Jean, my name is John Locke. Looks like you and me may be the only survivors. Shame. I'm not much of a mountain man. I can barely start a fire."

"I'm not too skilled myself. Maybe we can manage together, though."

The two began walking along the stream. As evening grew near they searched for a place to sleep for the night. To their surprise, in the distance they sighted a man sitting beside a roaring fire.

"Hello," they shouted from afar.

Glancing up, the man made no reply. When the two got to the fire, John spoke up.

"We thought we were the only two here. Boy, are we glad to see someone else. Mind if we stay here?"

We could sure use the fire and an extra friend."

Shrugging his shoulders, the man grunted approval.

"I'm John Locke and this is my friend Jean Rousseau. Whom do I have the pleasure of addressing?"

"Thomas Hobbes."

After a supper of fish, the three men settled down by the fire. After some idle chatter, the conversation soon turned to their plight.

Locke suggested a division of duties in which Hobbes maintain the camp and catch fish while he and Rousseau concentrated on rescue.

"Wait a second," interjected Hobbes. "I don't see where you get off giving orders. I run the camp, provide shelter, and catch food. The way I see things, you two should be listening to me."

"That's no way to run things," retorted Locke angrily. "You're talking about a monarchy. We live in America, and things are done democratically here."

"I know damn well we're in America, and I know this is a democratic country. That's why I came to live out here. I couldn't handle the way this country is run. All that democratic nonsense, what ever gets worked out that way? It leads to nothing but quarreling and confusion, and it's frustrating for me to observe. The only way to maintain order is to have one person take control."

"The problem with that," Rousseau broke in, "is

that power becomes twisted. The whole idea of a governing body is that it is representative of the general will. When there is only one person in charge there is no way to ensure that this will be carried out."

"Precisely," said Locke. "Therefore, we have a democratic government made up of three branches, each of which can check the other branch to make certain that power is not being misused."

"What do you mean misused?" asked Hobbes. "As long as the person remains in charge, then he cannot misuse power. Might is right."

"No, You're missing the point of government," Locke said. "Like Jean here said, it is an expression of the general will. When that is no longer being expressed, then the government is no longer valid. When the rights of the people are being violated, then it's their duty to change the government."

"The people sacrifice their 'rights' when they acknowledge a ruler," said Hobbes, "and this ruler has no duty to represent a 'general will'. This ruler is supposed to protect the people from harm and enable them to achieve pleasure. That is the only reason that there is a need for government. In my case, for example, my government wasn't expressing my will. I didn't need their protection or aid in achieving pleasure and so I'm self-sufficient."

"That's just selfish of you," said Rousseau. "You're not able to see the big picture. It's true that the governed do have to sacrifice something, but that is in the hands of the general will and the government which carries out this will. And I don't think I agree with your reasons for establishing government either."

"Nor do I," spoke Locke. "I think you paint a dark picture of humans. You seem to think that it's every man for himself. Well, Thomas, I think

you're wrong. Man is a naturally social animal. Man needs government in order to have a fair and neutral judge for disputes, and not merely as some kind of shelter from the storm as you seem to believe."

"I'm afraid you have far too much faith in human nature," spoke Hobbes. "Look at you two for example. Why did you come walking into my camp this afternoon? You saw the fire-you saw warmth and you saw protection from the unknowns lurking in the forest. If I did not offer you these things, you would have no need for me. But I am providing these for you, and that is why as long as you remain in my camp, you go by my rules."

This quieted Locke and Rousseau, and for a while the three sat gazing at the fire, lost in thought. After some time, though, huddled together close to the blazing fire, they slept.

HOW HE DID IT: AN ANALYSIS OF GORBACHEV'S STRATEGY FOR STAYING IN POWER

By Bridget Laffler

Once upon a time there lived an emperor who loved clothes more than anything else. His desire for new, fancy garments was famous far and wide, so it was not surprising that two rogues came up with the idea of swindling him by claiming to make cloth that only the wise could see. There really was no cloth, but, of course, everybody pretended to see it to avoid seeming stupid. The emperor himself unveiled these new "clothes" at a large parade. As he paraded naked down the street, the only person who dared to comment was one small boy, who shouted "He's not wearing any clothes..."

Recognize Hans Christian Anderson's "The Emperor's New Clothes"? The fairy tale was meant as a cautionary story about pride. Today it has taken on some eerie political connotations. Eastern Europe is looking more and more like William F. Buckley's bedtime story, and in the Evil Empire itself Mikhail Gorbachev is shouting loud and clear that the Leninist Empire is wearing no clothes. By uncovering the many flaws in the USSR's communist system, Gorbachev is putting himself in a position of extreme peril—the little boy in Anderson's tale playing in the high-stakes real world. He has managed to keep his hold on power by neutralizing his opposition, divorcing himself from the conservative Communist Party leadership and creating powers and constituencies all his own through strategic firings, structural changes, and playing to the general population.

Gorbachev started what the New York Times of Feb. 8, 1990 called the "Third Russian Revolution" in 1984 with his glasnost, or openness, and perestroika, or economic reform, campaigns. Since those first statements that the system needed

some change, the world has watched the Berlin Wall tumble down, a Solidarity man be elected Prime Minister of Poland, and a one-time political prisoner take charge of Czechoslovakia. Finally, on February 7, the Soviet Union itself took the first steps toward democracy as Article Six of the Soviet Constitution was abandoned, and with it the Communist party's "leading role" in Soviet life.

Gorbachev left the ousting of regional officials to the people themselves. As early as March 26, 1989, he allowed open elections of members of the Congress of People's Deputies that would select the Supreme Soviet. The turnout proved a vote of no confidence for traditional party leaders. Zbigniew Brezinski, former U.S. national security advisor, characterized the elections as "whenever there was a choice, the masses voted against the Communist regime" (Insight, April 17, 1989). Public dissatisfaction has grown even in the last few months, as, according to The Economist of Feb. 3, 1990, Gorbachev "seems to have stirred up the anger of ordinary party members at their bosses' 'unchecked powers and unearned privileges'". Now he is calling for open elections of local officials and councils.

With such measures, Gorbachev is bypassing the conservative Communist Party and going straight to the more liberal rank and file. For the moment, this should help him. Even lower-level Communist regulars are growing disillusioned with conservatism at the top. Journalist and long time party member Anatoly Pankov characterized the situation in the Feb. 9, 1990 New York Times with the words "there's not much confidence left in the party...a lot of members are far more

radical than the leadership." Gorbachev is viewed as someone who is willing to make changes. For this, he has personally become popular, a great attribute as the nation begins a multiparty system. A U.S. style opinion poll conducted last fall showed Gorbachev with a 47% approval rating, even as support plummeted for the party he leads. His nearest competition came from the even more liberal Boris Yeltsin, who had 14% (Chicago Tribune, Feb. 6, 1990).

Gorbachev is not trusting the momentary manipulation of personalities to keep him in power. He has made structural changes in the Soviet system that increase the institutional power of the president, currently Gorbachev, at the expense of the Party. In reforming the Supreme Soviet last year, he created an alternative power structure to rival that of the Party. The presidency now has such broad powers that William Safire was moved to remark "Mikhail Gorbachev has more power than any Czar, more of a personality cult than Stalin. He has undermined the corrupt party and created his own government hierarchy in which only the president need not stand for election. Hello, Superczar" (New York Times, Feb. 9, 1990).

Mikhail Gorbachev-Superczar, Superman, or whatever it pleases you to call him-has presided over some of the most potentially chaotic and revolutionary years in modern Russian history. In the space of seven years, he has moved the Soviet Union from the model of authoritarianism to a fetal multiparty system. He stayed in power while accomplishing this by neutralizing his opposition, the conservative high ranking Communist party officials, with strategic mini-purges, holding the Party accountable to the people, and making structural changes to strengthen and make independent his official positions. The danger of these moves lies in the fact that his enemy could change. Gorbachev is now at the mercy of the people rather than the Party, but if the economic and ethnic problems should worsen,

as they probably will, the people could turn against him. Ironically, his greatest threat now comes from the measures he has taken to keep himself in power. The changes Gorbachev has wrought will have repercussions across the globe, no matter how fairy tale-like they seem. And for Mr. Gorbachev, there is no guaranteed happy ending.

TWO POLITICAL VIEWS OF MACHIAVELLI AND OLIVER NORTH

VIEW I

By Ellen Petrick

In a time when subjects were merely tools of their dictator, Nicolo Machiavelli's principles were based on deceiving the common people in order to maintain a stable nation. In theory these principles should not be applied to a nation where government is based on the people's evaluation of valid information. However, this contradiction in theory is not the only thing wrong with applying Machiavelli's principles in a period of heightened awareness to political wrongs.

Machiavelli's main doctrine was that the end justifies the means. There are specific ends that Machiavelli had in mind. First and foremost was that the prince in question remain in power, and increase his power. In *The Prince*, Machiavelli stresses the importance of making sure that the nation is stable and perceived as such by the subjects, for if the subjects believe the nation unstable they may begin to doubt the ability of their ruler.

The means through which a prince can meet these ends are metaphorically based on the action of two animals. The actions of a prince should seem to his subjects like those of a lion. He should seem all-powerful and wise and embody the traits of mercy, faith, humanity, sincerity, and religion. This forged character relies on the assumption that ignorant subjects will take their ruler at face value, for under the skin of the lion lies a fox. According to Machiavelli, a prince should be able to act like a fox while appearing like a lion, in order to provide for personal gain or the safety of the nation. A prince must also have strong cunning, an ability for manipulation, and

a willingness to perform immoral deeds if they benefit him.

In the recent Iran-Contra affair Oliver North applied these Machiavellian principles, though perhaps unconsciously. His intended ends seem similar to those generalized by Machiavelli. During his testimony North says he was the only link between the Contras and the U.S. This position implies great personal power which North probably wanted to keep. Second, he says that someone had to give aid to the Contras in order to overthrow the communist government of Nicaragua and protect the U.S. Third, North says that the citizens of the U.S. should have no need to fear an attack from Central America. This sounds like Machiavelli's principles of "remain in power", "stabilize the nation", and "stabilize the minds of the subjects".

North also applies the lion/fox principles. North portrayed himself to the public as a lion, a super-patriot. He stood before the Congress in his full uniform, with all of his medals and decorations. He swore to his patriotic intentions, his strict observance of the foreign policy set down by the President, and to how he put himself in danger for the good of the country. And as foreseen by Machiavelli, thousands of citizens proclaimed him God's gift to the U.S. and looked no further, deceived by North's facade. Yet some people were able to pull back his thin skin and see that he also had the qualities of a fox. In order to reach his patriotic ends he used immoral means. North broke the law made by Congress that said that the U.S. would not give aid to the Contras. In

order to obtain funds for the aid, he sold weapons to a country currently hostile to the U.S.. In order to hide his actions North lied to Congress, falsified documents, and destroyed papers.

What's wrong with being immoral if it accomplishes a good end? Immorality is looked down on by society. People want government officials who perform moral deeds. Therefore immoral deeds must be hidden by those officials. Yet the democratic system requires that voting citizens have access to correct information. There is a moral consensus which supports this system. This moral consensus is embodied in the law. Law is "democratically moral" (Rudman, 602). As stated by Senator Rudman, "the American people have the constitutional right to be wrong". In theory North's actions of covering up and falsifying facts undermines our democratic system because it alters the information needed to make the laws that are supposed to define the moral consensus. Even if the law which was broken was the result of improper use of information in the first place, to break it would be to ignore the fundamental principle of our nation.

This is not the only thing wrong. Martin Luther King said that the ends cannot be separated from the means because the means are the ideals or the ends in the making. In order to "save" a democratic system, North destroyed its main principle. He defeated the purpose.

However, North is not the only person who follows these deceitful practices. President Bush recently led an attack on Panama. Like North he tried to portray himself as a lion. He was being called a wimp, and so he sent his troops to Panama and tried to capture a drug dealer. And like North, he also showed the qualities of a fox. He ordered warlike actions on another country without Congress declaring war. He broke international law by suddenly moving in and replacing another country's leader. Bush evidently also believes in "the end justifies the means" theory.

In order to stop the drug-caused deaths of thousands of U.S. adults and children, he caused the deaths of hundreds of Panamanian adults and children. In order to stop a dictator who caused grief, Bush caused grief.

Fortunately, although Machiavelli's principles may hinder the functioning of U.S. democracy, so far they have not destroyed it. Using Machiavellian principles in a democracy is illogical and dangerous. Once the cycle of deceit starts, then politicians can justify anything because it is good for the country. The principles will be applied whenever a politician has a chance for personal gain. Soon the ends, not just the means, will need to be justified. Citizens have to prove Machiavelli wrong, and stop taking politicians and political events at face value just because someone says it's good for the country.

VIEW II

By David Czerwinski

In a democracy, one can't decide if the end justifies the means without weighing the means and the end against each other. There are some guidelines to follow in order to weigh the means which include deciding if something is legally or morally wrong. The "weight" of the means must then be weighed against the weight of the end, which can be determined by considering, among other things, whether the end is right according to the individual's morals, and the public's morals, and whether the end will save or injure other people.

To weigh the means, one must first realize that in a democracy, there are two sets of rules that people should follow, morals and laws. An individual's morals are usually more important than the government's laws, unless the individual's

morals contrast greatly with the morals of the rest of the public.

The first set of rules, laws, are made for the well-being of the people (also under this heading are bills, which prevent the government from doing what the public doesn't want). If the means to the end involve breaking any rules of the government, which the breaker of the rules would ordinarily agree with, then his actions are not justified by his goal because, if the means were weighed on their own, they would be unacceptable even to the breaker of the rules. Also, if the means are such that they would not be acceptable according to the general public, or they would put someone in danger, then the means would be wrong because they violate the beliefs of the general public, which are the basis for a democracy.

The second set of rules, morals, guide people in deciding whether to do something that, though it is legal, might be "wrong", or though it is illegal, might be "right". These rules are difficult to explain, but stem from the "human" quality of our species and it follows that they have great authority in the human community. The moral values of a person outweigh the government's laws because the laws are made to fit the people's morals, not the other way around. If the majority of the people, based on moral judgment, disagree with a law, the law should be changed. Morals supersede the law; law does not supersede morals.

One more thing that must be considered is death. Life is the most important thing on this planet; so, when the end and means are weighed, life is a significant consideration. In order to justify a "means" which includes the loss of someone's life, the end must be very important. If the end is to save a life, the means may contradict both law and morality.

Now let's apply these ideas to the political behavior of Machiavelli and Oliver North. Machiavelli

wrote about the way a prince should behave if he wishes to keep his power. He believed, basically, that the end, to keep power, justified most means. The first requirement for a prince, according to Machiavelli, is: "be a fox to recognize traps, and a lion to frighten wolves". In order to do this, a prince must show the qualities of mercy, faith, humanity, sincerity, and religion. However, a prince need not possess all of these qualities, rather just make his subjects believe he possesses them. Also, if a prince is ruling atheists, or inhumane people, he should act atheistic or inhumane. In other words, a prince must deceive his subjects in order to please them and thus keep power.

Since Machiavelli was making his plans for a government in which the people had no power, his belief can not be strictly weighed according to the preceding principles. If he had been making his rules for a democracy, it is obvious that his end does not justify the means because the general public does not want to be lied to or taken advantage of. Since, however, he was not planning for a democracy, the scales must be adjusted. His ideas didn't contradict the rule of law because the prince made laws and could suit them to his purposes. Because he preached lying and cheating, his ideas do contradict the rules of morals, but not much because the people wouldn't mind how immoral their prince was as long as they were taken care of, made secure and prosperous. His ideas also do not contradict the rule about life, because none of them puts any more lives in danger than any competing system. Thus, on the adjusted scales, Machiavelli's end to get and maintain power justifies the means.

Oliver North, in his testimony concerning the "Iran-Contra affair", shared several of Machiavelli's views about government. Basically, North felt, like Machiavelli, that the end justifies the means. He said that covert operations must be kept secret in order that they succeed even if this means breaking a few rules and acting independ-

ently of the rest of the government. North decided that what he did (give support to the Contras) was alright, although Congress had passed a bill prohibiting it, because the U.S. must keep communist governments away from our hemisphere no matter how they do it. Since Congress wasn't helping the Contras, North took matters into his own hands, assuming that it was his duty, as an individual, to do what he felt correct, regardless of what Congress or the citizens of the U.S. felt at that moment.

Even though Oliver North was acting on behalf of the U.S. government, everything the government wants to achieve should be achieved according to the government's rules, because the general public wants it that way, and because employees of the government have accepted those rules to begin with. North was wrong in doing what he did because he broke a rule he had accepted with his office. When weighed against the principles established, North's actions break the "rule of obedience to law". They also break the "rule of morals", by violating the code of honor and incorruptibility expected of any office holder. As to the "rule of life", North's actions come out about even because, while he was funding a revolution in which people were killed, his main objective, in the long run, was to save, and improve, many lives. Thus, on the scales, North's end of helping the Contras does not justify his means.

It is clear that Machiavelli and North both agreed that the end justifies the means. Both felt an individual should use his power to achieve a necessary end. Machiavelli was worried about his prince's personal fate while also expressing concern for the fate of Italian unity, whereas Oliver North worried primarily about serving the nation's best interests as he saw them. North did what he did because he thought he was doing what U.S. citizens wanted and thus was helping the Contras. There is no evidence he sought individual power and little evidence he acted for the political gain of Ronald Reagan.

References

Machiavelli, Niccolo. The Prince. New York: New American Library, 1952.

Rudman, Senator Warren in Taking The Stand: The Testimony of Lieutenant Colonel Oliver North. [complete transcripts of testimony before the joint congressional committee] New York: Pocket Books, 1987.

THE EXISTENCE OF EVIL

By Eric Truett

Many skeptics have used the existence of evil and tragedy as proof that a caring, loving God does not exist. They state that an all-powerful entity surely would not allow the scourges of our society to exist. These arguments are persuasive but flawed. God's existence can be reconciled with evil on two levels. First, he gave humans free will, and that freedom gives him the opportunity to do harm as well as good. Man was supposedly created in God's image, and thus must have the same control over himself as the Lord does. Secondly, suffering and evil are not necessarily bad things. God might be a utilitarian who balances pain and pleasure. Consequently, he would allow evil on the basis that it builds moral character among the good, rewards those people who made correct choices, and gives meaning to pleasure. John Hick points out that in a world in which actions can never have harmful consequences, good and evil thoughts are rewarded equally, and there is no incentive to take benevolent action, since one's actions can never harm anyone. Furthermore, pleasure is best understood after a painful experience. A man who has not seen his wife in five years will appreciate a night at home more than a man who sees his spouse every day. Likewise, a piece of bread to a starving man is filling, whereas others might think it a paltry meal.

The concepts of free will and determinism have been hotly disputed for ages, but a general consensus has formed that free will must be accepted if life is to have any meaning. If determinism is accepted, the foundations of society would be destroyed. No responsibility could be assessed for any action, and efforts to change would be fruitless because life is already planned for the subject. Accepting free will is an important first step in justifying the simultaneous existence of

evil and God. Man was created in God's image, and received the same ability to choose as God has. Since God is all-powerful, he has the ability to choose good, evil, or whatever else He wants to do, guided only by His conscience, and has chosen to be benevolent. Likewise, people must have those same choices. Society creates additional restraints against deviant behavior, but it essentially depends upon the person which way his life will turn. In order to avoid contradiction, God has to allow man to make wrong decisions. If man was unable to do wrong, he would not truly be free, being more like an animal guided by instinct, and would not be God's image.

This point explains the existence of human-caused harm, but does not fully account for natural disasters or seemingly accidental events. An ideal world, in which no harm can come from any action, may not be as ideal as some would think. John Hick described a possible utopia in his *Philosophy of Religion*:

Suppose, contrary to fact, that this world were a paradise from which all possibility of pain and suffering were excluded. The consequences would be very far-reaching. For example, no one could ever injure anyone else: the murderer's knife would turn to paper or his bullets to thin air; the bank safe, robbed of a million dollars would miraculously become filled with another million dollars (without this device proving inflationary); fraud, deceit, conspiracy, and treason would somehow always leave the fabric of society undamaged. Again, no one would ever be injured by accident: the mountain climber, steeplejack, or playing child falling from a height would float

unharmful to the ground...There would be no need to work, since no harm could result from avoiding work; there would be no call to be concerned for others in time of need or danger, for in such a world there could be no real needs or dangers (Hick 45-46).

In order to accommodate such an existence, all laws of nature and mankind would have to be variable, operating in some instances and inoperable in others. Even more importantly, our concepts of good and evil would have no meaning in this 'perfect' world. All actions would receive similar rewards; a man trying to kill would get in no more trouble than a man who spent his free time aiding the disadvantaged. No action could be deemed wrong, because nothing would cause any harm to any other person. The traditional conceptions of morality would be irrelevant, since there would be no reward for doing good. Such an existence would *de facto* strip man of his free will, since free will implies that man takes responsibility for his actions. In a utopia, no responsibility need be taken, since no harm can result from poor judgement. As discussed previously, the absence of free will would deny the point of man's existence, since he would be no different from animals. Hick concludes that, "...an environment intended to make possible the growth in free beings of the finest characteristics of personal life, must have a good deal in common with our present world...If it did not contain the particular trials and perils which our world contains, it would have to contain others instead" (46). Man simply cannot grow and flourish without obstacles to overcome. Society respects those people who have overcome the most adversity, and the people who have been able to withstand tragedy and still live life are the ones who appreciate pleasure the most.

Suffering seems inherently bad; people are unjustly punished and deprived not because of anything they have done wrong. Often, the most

pious persons have to live the hardest lives. One can make a strong point about how a caring God would never let these events occur. The problem with this line of reasoning is that it assumes that suffering is evil in all instances, and it fails to recognize the benefits that pain brings. Peter DeVries, in *The Blood of the Lamb*, adores his young daughter who dies of cancer. He finds no consolation in religion or the idea of progress. Others try to console him. A youngster gives him a book on Zen, which tells the reader not to worry. This is absurd, DeVries feels, in light of the pain he has experienced. A man on a train offers more insightful commentary. He tells DeVries to be thankful for the time he had with his daughter, because a short-lived experience can still be special. The man's daughter is not particularly exceptional, and his wife is an alcoholic. One of DeVries daughter's teachers tells him to be thankful that he could have children; she was too homely ever to find a husband and to have a child of her own. A person who has suffered greatly, such as a woman who has a paralyzed son, can have a meaningful life, by helping those in need even at great expense to themselves, while others' superficially enjoyable existence, such as that of a playboy, can have no true meaning.

Thus, suffering and an enjoyable, significant life are not mutually exclusive. In fact, suffering might be a precondition for a meaningful existence, and for true realization of joy. Viktor Frankl has greater insight on the matter. He writes that, "Whenever one is confronted with an inescapable, unavoidable situation, whenever one has to face a fate that cannot be changed, i.e., an incurable disease, such as an inoperable cancer, just then is one given a last chance to actualize the highest value, to fulfill the deepest meaning, the meaning of suffering. For what matters above all is the attitude we take toward suffering, the attitude in which we take our suffering upon ourselves" (Frankl 356). God has the ability to correct these crises, but does not do so, because such ordeals build the human spirit and moral

character.

Finally, arguments denying God's existence fail to consider that existence on Earth might only be one stage in eternal existence for man. The soul would theoretically live forever, growing with each life it lives. Thus, death is not necessarily the end, or an extreme tragedy. It is possible that what man conceives as the world is a mere testing ground for his place in eternity. A favorable performance on earth means he is deserving of a place in heaven, while an abhorrent existence means hell is a certainty. Suffering is a test of a man's strength and his worthiness of eternal pleasure. It is also a test of his faith. Kierkegaard writes of a leap of faith, in which man decides to believe in God's existence, regardless of evidence to the contrary. Man's willingness to do so means he will reap the benefits, but he must have the choice in order for the reward to be justified. God is not uncaring when he allows man's world to be less than perfect; instead, He is merely deciding who desires His blessings.

Many people have trouble reconciling God with the many problems faced by mankind. If God were truly kind, they say, he would never allow such injustices to happen. These are valid reservations, but these people misunderstand the nature of free will and the importance of suffering. In order to avoid contradiction, man must have the ability to choose evil as well as good. Otherwise, all choice would be meaningless, and man would be determined. Additionally, suffering strengthens the moral character of mankind and prepares faithful adherents for a life in heaven. Only if man is challenged can he deserve his place in eternity. An existence where no choice can be wrong and where there is no incentive to do good is contrary to the idea of man carrying out God's work.

Bibliography

DeVries, Peter. Blood of the Lamb. New York:

Little, Brown, and Co. 1961.

Frankl, Victor. Man's Search for Meaning. New York: Washington Square Press, 1963.

Hick, John. Philosophy of Religion. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

THE TIME IS NOW FOR RACIAL UNIFICATION

By Juanta Bennett

Why? In 1990, South Africa is not free. In 1990, evident segregation at high school dances is being ignored.

In 1990, Nelson Mandela is still imprisoned.

In 1990, there was gross misconduct displayed at a basketball game by students who would not respect and accept one another, my friends.

There is a war going on—a racial war. In this war, there are no winners. The soldiers in this war are not defending their countries, but shielding their hearts. They have yet to apply love to their lives.

They have forgotten the man who wiped the film of bigotry from the window of the world to allow equality to shine through; the man who uplifted the spirits of the meek and humble and gave hope that one day they would not have to hold their heads down because the pressure of shame was too great; the man who reached out to the people and up to the Lord and somehow tried to combine the two.

They have forgotten the man who loved and saved humanity.

Such a man was Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Martin Luther King had a dream that the bias of racial hatred would be diminished and replaced with human compassion, and now that our great leader has passed, it is our obligation to uphold that dream.

Do you think the war ended when President Lincoln signed the emancipation proclamation or when Hitler's army was finally defeated? Maybe

you thought the war ended when thousands of men and women marched on Washington and later marched on home. These were mere steps towards freedom. True freedom cannot be bought, signed or bargained. True freedom comes from the heart, and if we are to live in Dr. King's world of peace and harmony, we must no longer allow religion, race, or creed to cloud the respect we have for one another.

The holocaust and slavery were ugly realities of history, things that we cannot change. Therefore, we must move forward and not allow ourselves to fall backwards.

Students of Oak Park and River Forest High School, the time is now. It's time for unity. We must decide whether we contribute to the dream or sell out to a senseless color war.

We can rise and be the almighty human race and that we are truly together in unity, not separated by color.

(Juanta Bennet is a sophomore at Oak Park and River Forest High School. This essay won the high school's 1989-90 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Oratorical Contest, and Bennett read it at the high school's Jan. 11 convocation honoring the late Dr. King.)

PATRIOTS OF PROMISE

Memorial Day Speech - 1989

By Tracy Clay

To honor and recognize. That is our purpose for being here this sunny morning in May, far removed from the wars which claimed the lives of the men and women we are here to remember today. Usually, speakers given my opportunity, to address the bulk of my peers, take this chance to admonish, exhort, incite, or demand something from you. I am going to break with tradition and, instead, make an observation, to share a realization that I have only recently come by; I am proud of being an American, and I am proud of this country. Before going any further let me qualify that statement by saying that I am a new breed of patriot—and I think most of you are as well. In his book, Patriotism in America, John J. Pullen examines patriotism as an American phenomenon from 1776 to just after the close of the Vietnam War. Pullen draws the conclusion that for the Vietnam generation and those after them, being "patriotic" would not mean protecting the status quo but instead a desire, even a demand for just change. "Those generations after Vietnam will be loyal not only to what this country is, but to what it might be," he said. "How do they love their country? By making their country more lovable." In three short words, we are the patriots of promise. Of course, there are several valid reasons why discovering one is loyal to his country can be socially unfashionable and morally uncomfortable. At one time or another, we have all been mystified, saddened, and angered by our government's poor policies, unfounded prejudice and endless posturing into the world arena where expediency and not justice seem to be the rule of thumb in our dealings with Nicaragua, the Soviet Union, and South Africa. Closer to home, one need but walk downtown to realize that the American Dream is not an economic reality for all; neither is the equality that our

forefathers spoke of. In the face of these enormous problems, why doesn't that vast majority of us give in and resign ourselves in inequality? Why don't we join the apathetic cynics who claim the "system" can never be beaten? To put it bluntly, why don't we simply give up on this country? I submit it is the promise this country has always embodied. The willingness to experiment with ideas and institutions that has produced, for most of us, a standard of living unparalleled in the world; a wealth of social, political and economic opportunities; a forum to disagree with our government and the ability to do something about it. A willingness to experiment that has created a system flexible enough to expand and include women and minorities, and yet firm enough to protect our basic civil liberties for over two hundred years. For all of these things, I am both grateful and proud. However, it is not these practicalities that I am most proud of—no, I am proudest of the possibilities and promise this country offers. No peoples have a greater opportunity to better themselves and the human condition than we, as Americans. And nowhere is there a greater chance for success than here in America. I also believe that I am not alone, that we are all imbued with a sense of reform, a desire to redeem the as yet unfulfilled promise of this country that makes patriots of us all. To realize that we are being patriotic when we acknowledge this country's flaws, applaud its virtues, and question its leaders and their actions, is to repay a small fraction of the debt we owe to the men and women who died to keep the promise alive. Perhaps Robert Kennedy was speaking of this patriotism of promise when he said, "Some look at what is, and ask why? I look at what could be, and say why not?"

**OAK PARK AND RIVER FOREST HIGH
SCHOOL-DISTRICT 200
201 N. Scoville Avenue
Oak Park, Illinois 60302**

BOARD OF EDUCATION

**DR. ALEXANDER SCHMIDT, PRESIDENT
BUNNY CAREY, SECRETARY
WANDA CORNELIUS
WILLIAM R. CRAGG
ALICE M. RALPH
NANCY SMILEY
JASON STRODE**

SUPERINTENDENT/PRINCIPAL

DR. GEORGE A. GUSTAFSON

**CHAIRMAN,
DIVISION OF HISTORY,
GOVERNMENT AND
SOCIAL SCIENCES**

THOMAS D. FERGUSON